3 1761 03576 9421

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/genuinehistoryof00whituoft

THE GENUINE HISTORY OF THE BRITONS ASSERTED.

IN

A FULL AND CANDID REFUTATION

OF

MR. MACPHERSON'S INTRODUCTION

TO THE

HISTORY OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

By the Rev. Mr. WHITAKER,

AUTHOR OF

THE HISTORY OF MANCHESTER.

Sold by DODSLEY, Pall-Mall; PAYNE, Mews-gate; BAKER and LEIGH, York-Street, Covent-Garden; CADELL, Strand; WHITE, LOWNDES, Fleet-Street; DAVIS, Holborne; PARKER, FLETCHER, Oxford; and the MERRILS, Cambridge. M DCC LXXII.

LIBRARY
DEC 13 1968
UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

DA
135
I 228

THE GENUINE HISTORY OF THE BRITONS ASSERTED.

CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION, *p.* 1—9

THE NATURE AND TIME OF THE FIRST COLONY THAT CAME INTO BRITAIN, 11—32

THE NATURE AND TIME OF THE SECOND, 33—66

THE POSITION, MANNERS, AND TRANSACTIONS OF BOTH IN THE ISLAND, 66—105

THE DERIVATION OF THE IRISH FROM BOTH, 106—153

THE DERIVATION OF THE SCOTS FROM THE IRISH, 154—293

THE CONCLUSION, 295—304.

THE

THE GENUINE HISTORY OF THE BRITONS ASSERTED.

TO an hiſtorian that is curious to obſerve the ſtriking variations of national characters, and to a philoſopher that is delighted to note the advancements of the human mind in ſentiment and knowledge, the great and recent change in the hiſtorical genius of Scotland muſt appear equally remarkable and pleaſing [1]. Accuſtomed as the Scotch have for ages been to believe implicitly in a fictitious and fantaſtical hiſtory, they have lately emancipated their minds from the bondage, and in a great meaſure

[1] Of Scotland, properly ſo called, or the country to the North of Forth and Clyde.

renounced the fabulous ſyſtem of their anceſtors. The deſpicable forgeries of their lying annaliſts are now no longer obtruded upon us, by the zeal of miſtaken patriotiſm, for the truths and realities of hiſtory. They are either brought forward with a diffidence that betrays its own convictions of their falſhood, are mentioned merely to be condemned, or are entirely paſt over in a contemptuous ſilence. And that enlarged and maſculine turn of thinking, which commenced near two centuries ago in England, has happily extended its influence among the mountains of Scotland. The monſtrous creations of a Geoffrey and a Fordun, or the authors that they plundered, the wild ſpecters and goblins which had for ages hovered in the gloom of our earlier hiſtory, are now chaced away by the daylight that is diffuſed over the face of our annals. The Grecian and Roman writers are allowed to be the only ſtandards of hiſtorical truth. And the whole Iſland is now for the firſt time united in the proſecution of its genuine hiſtory.

The human mind, however, even in its detection of the greateſt falſities, is continually checked in its operations by the feebleneſs of its own efforts, and is perpetually ſtopt in its progreſs by the contractedneſs of its own views. Its views are generally limited to a ſingle point. And its efforts are generally too weak, even when they have triumphed over ſome of its own

own prejudices, to counteract the full force of national vanity, and to suppress the whole power of hereditary credulity, in itself or in others. Ireland remains to this day superstitiously devoted to her ancient history, sullenly turns away from the light of reformation that is spread over the neighbouring island, and wraps herself in the gloom of her own legendary annals. And the genius of Scotland has so greatly vitiated her judgement by the long indulgence of her fancy in history, that even now, when she is reclaimed from her former extravagancies, she seems strongly inclined to wanton excursions in the regions of fact and incident. That national vanity which originally generated, and afterwards supported, the mis-shapen brood of her former fictions, appears equally active at present among the historical writers of Scotland, and has equally a tendency to distort and disguise the genuine history of our island. And this is particularly obvious in the repeated attempts that have been recently made by them, to new-model the ancient accounts of Ireland and the Scotch, and to fashion them to the fantastic standard of their own popular caprices. The ancient historians speak of Ireland as the mother of the Scots, and Caledonia as the parent of the Picts: and the present Scotch must therefore be the descendants of Irish emigrants, who settled amongst the Caledonians, and communicated their own name to them. But this, it

ſeems, the Scotch diſdain to admit. And in that ſpirit of humourſome pride, which had originally loaded the hiſtory of their country with all the impertinence of dreams, the whole current of hiſtory is to be violently oppoſed, the Ireland of the Romans is to be interpreted into the preſent Scotland, and the Scotch are to be made the Aborigines of Caledonia. This conduct reſults from ſuch a littleneſs of ſoul, and betrays ſuch a vulgarity of prejudice and paſſion, that candour would gladly heſitate to believe, if fact did not convince her of the truth of it.

The firſt appearance of this wayward folly was in the writings of Sir George Mackenzie, the firſt Scotch author, I think, who dared, however gently, to reject all the ruder and earlier fictions of the national hiſtory [1]. The adhering remains of the legendary ſpirit of the times, it appeared coæval with the firſt dawn of hiſtorical liberty in Scotland, and has remained the com-

[1] In his Defence of the royal line of Scotland, 1685, in anſwer to Bp. Lloyd's Hiſtorical account of Church-government, 1684, and in his Further Defence, 1686, in reply to Bp. Stillingfleet's Animadverſions prefixed to his Origines Sacræ, 1685. Sir George was aſſiſted in theſe works by Sir Robert Sibbald, Sir James Dalrymple, and ſeveral other Scotch antiquarians (See Dalrymple's Collections, 1705, p. 1. Preface). And Sir George, in p. 359 &c. vol. I. of all his works, repeatedly but ſilently rejects all the long accounts of the Scots before Fergus I, and ſo boldly cuts off a whole millennium from their hiſtory.

panion

panion and the diſhonour of it to the preſent period [1]. And the ſame ſpirit has been particularly cultivated, within theſe few years, by two gentlemen of real learning and conſiderable talents. One of them, James Macpherſon Eſq:, to whom the friends of poetry and hiſtory muſt acknowledge themſelves greatly indebted, for calling out the Poems of Oſſian from their original obſcurity in an unknown language and an unviſited corner of the iſland, and for giving them to us in a verſion that ſeems to be at once bold and faithful, all animation, harmony, and grace; this gentleman, in his prefaces and notes to thoſe poems, revived and enlarged the ſyſtem of Sir George, purſued and invigorated his attempts, and violently engaged the Caledonian bard in the conteſt. Mr. Macpherſon was ſeconded in the year 1768 by John Macpherſon D. D. a miniſter in the Iſle of Sky, and the author of Critical Diſſertations on the Origin &c. of the ancient Caledonians, the Picts, and the Scots. This work, the intended

[1] In Sir Robert Sibbald's treatiſe on the Thule of the ancients, publiſhed in Wallace's Orkney Iſlands, 1693, and in Gibſon's Camden, 1695; in Sir James Dalrymple's Collections for the Scottiſh hiſtory, 1705; in Dr. Mackenzie's Preface to his Lives of Scots writers, vol. III. fol. 1708; in Dr. Abercromby's Martial Atchievements of the Scots nation, in vol. II. fol. 1711; and in a Mr. Malcolm's Caledonian Letters, about 1738, I think.

publication of which was repeatedly announced to the world, ſome years before its appearance, in a ſtrain of high commendation by Mr. Macpherſon [1], ſeems to have been alſo reſcued by him from the fate often incident to poſthumous productions, and was, I ſuppoſe, actually prefaced by him. And, in theſe agreeable and ſenſible diſſertations, an intimate acquaintance with the Highland language, and no inconſiderable knowledge of ancient hiſtory, have been made the inſtruments to wreſt the hiſtorical accounts of the ancients from their true baſis, and to puſh aſide the whole ſyſtem of the Caledonian and Iriſh Hiſtory from its fixed and natural center. And Mr. Macpherſon has lately cloſed the attack in a regular and formal diſquiſition upon the ſame principles. With a knowledge of the

[1] In the preface to vol. I. of Oſſian it is ſaid: "It was at "firſt intended to prefix to Oſſian's Poems a diſcourſe con- "cerning the ancient inhabitants of Britain; but as a Gen- "tleman in the North of Scotland, who has thoroughly ex- "amined the antiquities of this iſland, and is perfectly ac- "quainted with all the branches of the Celtic tongue, is juſt "now preparing for the preſs a work on that ſubject, the "curious are referred to it." And in the Diſſertation prefixed to vol. II. are theſe words: "This ſubject I have only lightly "touched upon, as it is to be diſcuſſed with more perſpicuity, "and at a much greater length, by a Gentleman, who has "thoroughly examined the antiquities of Britain and Ireland." p. xix.

Highland

Highland language ſuperior to the Doctor's, and with a much deeper inſight into ancient hiſtory, he has brought the whole collected weight of evidence together, and has concentrated all the ſcattered rays of the argument into a ſingle point. With a faculty of thinking uncommonly vigorous and lively, and with a flow of language peculiarly elegant and ſpirited, he has given ſuch additional ſtrength to the argument, and has thrown ſuch an attractive gloſs over his reaſonings, that to mere modern innovations he lends all the ſemblance of antiquity, he perſuades us where he does not convince, and bribes us over to his party with all hiſtory and reaſon againſt him.

In the only volume of the Hiſtory of Mancheſter which has yet been publiſhed, ſome deſire had been ſhewed, and ſome pains had been taken, to clear up the original annals of Caledonia and Ireland, and to reſcue both from the folly of ancient fictions on the one hand, and from the wildneſs of modern perverſions on the other. But Mr. Macpherſon's Introduction, which was publiſhed about three weeks after it, has thrown us back in the progreſs of hiſtorical knowledge, and has once more involved the annals in all the ſophiſtry of fiction and fancy. This therefore is a peculiar call upon me, to vindicate the notices thus indirectly attacked by Mr. Macpherſon,

and, what is of much more conſequence in itſelf, to aſſert the violated principles of hiſtorical faith, to protect the inſulted cauſe of ancient hiſtory, and to eſtabliſh the annals of Caledonia and Ireland upon their former baſis. And I willingly obey the call. With all the deference that is due to Mr. Macpherſon as a gentleman of genius and ſentiment, I ſhall regularly purſue his accounts and his reaſonings, as they ſucceſſively preſent themſelves in his pages. Diſdaining the little artifices of controverſy, too honourable, I hope, to create the faults that I cannot find, and too candid, I truſt, to urge ſtrongly the mere failings of humanity; I ſhall not expatiate upon little inaccuracies of expreſſion, and I ſhall not triumph over little miſtakes in facts. I ſhall confine myſelf to the tranſactions of the Britons before and after their ſettlement in this iſland. And I ſhall not merely refer to the pages in Mr. Macpherſon for the paſſages that I mean to combat. This mode of proceeding, not being ſufficiently diſtinct and accurate with regard to the erroneous words and obnoxious aſſertions, is frequently the cauſe of various miſtakes in the writer, and is almoſt ſure to leave the reader in a maze of uncertainty and doubt. Not to counteract my own purpoſes, I ſhall conſtantly produce Mr. Macpherſon's arguments in his own words.

words. Not to injure Mr. Macpherſon's reaſonings by maiming them, I ſhall give them in the quotation all the extent and force that they have in the original. And I ſhall place my reply at the foot, and point it directly at the heart, of each.

CHAP.

CHAP. I.

CONCERNING THE FIRST COLONY THAT MR. MACPHERSON BRINGS INTO BRITAIN.

PAG. 7, 8. The Phocæans founding Marſeilles "when the elder Tarquin is ſaid to "have held the reins of government at Rome, "the improvements introduced by the Pho-"cæans had a great and ſudden effect upon the "manners of the Gauls. Agriculture, before "imperfectly underſtood, was proſecuted with "vigour and ſucceſs. The means of ſubſiſtence "being augmented, population increaſed of "courſe; migrating expeditions were formed, "to eaſe the country of its number of inhabi-"tants.—Spain, Italy, —were filled with colonies "from Gaul."

Here the vigorous proſecution of agriculture, and the augmented means of ſubſiſtence, are conſidered as the original cauſe of emigrations. But ſurely this is aſſerted in oppoſition equally to ſound

ſound reaſoning and univerſal experience. The increaſe in the population of any kingdom, ſo far as it is occaſioned merely by the increaſe in the means of ſubſiſtence, will only be in an adequate proportion to it. The immediate cauſe, and the immediate effect, will be exactly equivalent. And conſequently the improvements in agriculture can never be productive of migrations. This is obvious reaſoning, embarraſſed by no intricacies and obſcured by no refinements of thought. And the uninterrupted experience of the world confirms the truth of it. The wretched proviſion that is furniſhed to the common people of Ireland and the Highlands, is continually impelling them into other countries. And the infinite multiplication of the neceſſaries and comforts of life in England, is as continually drawing the lower ranks of both into Southern Britain.—But I proceed to the hiſtory.

The original incident in this long chain of events, the ſettlement of the Phocæans in Gaul, is fixed to the reign of the elder Tarquin. The communication of their improved agriculture to the neighbouring Gauls, the general adoption of it by all the various and military tribes of that extenſive country, the augmentation in the means of ſubſiſtence, the increaſe in the ſtate of population, and this riſing at laſt to ſuch an extreme degree, that they, who before only "wandered "after their cattle or game over the face" of the country,

country [1], were obliged to diſburden themſelves by detaching large colonies into the neighbouring regions; all theſe ſucceſſive events, even in the moſt ſudden and rapid conſecution of incidents, muſt neceſſarily have taken up one or two ages. And yet the migration into Italy particularly is fixed, by the very authority that Mr. Macpherſon quotes for it, in the very reign during which the Phocæans are ſaid immediately before to have ſettled in Gaul. De tranſitu in Italiam Gallorum hæc accepimus, ſays Livy in Mr. Macpherſon's own note: Priſco Tarquinio Romæ regnante,—Ambigatus,—exonerare prægravente turbâ regnum cupiens, Belloveſum ac Sigoveſum—miſſurum ſe eſſe in quas Dii dediſſent auguriis ſedes oſtendit. Belloveſo in Italiam viam Dii dederunt. And Mr. Macpherſon thus explicitly aſſerts the ſame in p. 9, "The Gauls — "firſt entered Italy, according to Livy, in the "reign of the elder Tarquin." Theſe migrations therefore were actually coæval with the ſettlement at Marſeilles, and could not be occaſioned by any remote conſequences reſulting from it. And the expedition into Italy, particularly, was actually undertaken *before* the ſettlement of the Phocæans in Gaul. It was begun, and Belloveſus had already advanced to the foot of the Alps, when the news arrived of the Phocæan de-

[1] P. 7.

ſcent

ſcent at Marſeilles. And this appears even from the account to which Mr. Macpherſon has referred us for the contrary. Bellovesus—, profectus ingentibus peditum equitumque copiis, in Tricaſtinos venit. Alpes inde oppoſitæ erant—. Ibi quum velut ſeptos montium altitudo teneret Gallos, circumſpectarentque quanam per juncta cœlo juga in alium orbem terrarum tranſirent,—allatum eſt, advenas quærentes agrum ab Salyum gente oppugnari. Maſſilienſes erant hi, navibus a Phocæâ profecti [1]. And Mr. Macpherſon's firſt principle is entirely overborne by the weight of his own authorities, and by the force of his own acknowledgements.

And another objection of the ſame nature ſeems to lie as ſtrongly againſt it. Mr. Macpherſon ſeems to have written this part of his diſſertation with all the haſty vivacity of a man of genius, purſuing a train of new and ſplendid ideas, but not rigidly examining their uniformity and agreement with each other.—The ſame civilized Grecians, that are ſaid to have ſettled in Gaul, and to have thereby introduced a more improved agriculture into it, are equally ſaid to have previouſly ſettled in Italy. "The Pe-"laſgi of Peloponneſus and the iſlands of "the Archipelago were the firſt of the Euro-"pean Nomades who quitted the ambulatory "life of their anceſtors and applied themſelves

[1] Livy, l. v. c. 34.

"to

" to the arts of civil life.—Improving their navi-
" gation by degrees, they ſailed to the weſt,
" ſeized upon the neareſt coaſt of Italy, and
" moving into the heart of that country, met
" with the Umbri, and roſe into a mixed nation
" under the name of Latins. Extending their na-
" vigation ſtill further,—the Phocæans made an
" eſtabliſhment on the coaſt of Gaul [1]." The earlier Pelaſgi therefore muſt have introduced the arts of civil life into Italy, as the later did into Gaul. And an improved agriculture muſt have been brought into Italy ſome time before it was carried into Gaul. The earlier Pelaſgi alſo, actually ſettling in the heart of Italy, and actually mixing with the natives in it, muſt have had a much greater communication with the Italians than the Phocæans could have had with the Gauls, and muſt have propagated all the arts of their country with much greater ſucceſs. And the conſequences deduced by Mr. Macpherſon from the introduction of the Grecian agriculture into Gaul, muſt have been equally and more early the conſequences of it in Italy; and the migrations occaſioned by it muſt therefore have been, not incurſions from Gaul into Italy, but expeditions from Italy into Gaul. This muſt obviouſly have been the caſe, according to Mr. Macpherſon's own repreſentations and reaſonings. And the foundation of his ſyſtem

[1] P. 7.

is

is here a ſecond time deſtroyed by the very hand that is employed in laying it.

P. 6—9. "The Scythians of the weſtern "Europe were, for the firſt time, mentioned "under the name of Celtæ, by Herodotus, in "the Eighty-ſeventh Olympiad. To inveſtigate "the origin of that appellation, we muſt return "into a period of remote antiquity. The Pe-"laſgi of Peloponneſus—ſailed to the weſt, "ſeized upon the neareſt coaſt of Italy, and "—made an eſtabliſhment on the coaſt of "Gaul—. The improvements introduced by "them had a great and ſudden effect upon the "manners of the Gauls. Agriculture—was pro-"ſecuted—. Population increaſed—; migrating "expeditions were formed to eaſe the country "of its number of inhabitants, and the regions "of Europe—received ſucceſſive ſwarms of "Gallic emigrants.—This revolution in the "north of Europe extended to the greater part "of its inhabitants the appellation of Celtæ, "which is an adjective derived from Gael, the "aboriginal name of the inhabitants of antient "Gaul."

The original and primary cauſe of the Gallic emigrations, is here plainly aſſerted to be the improved agriculture communicated to them by the Grecians. This had a "great and ſudden

" effect upon the manners of the Gauls," producing migrations. And therefore the Gauls, according to this repreſentation, had never formed any migrating expeditions before. But in p. 9, immediately after the words above, we are told, that " though the expeditions of the " Gauls, ſubſequent to the ſettlement of the " Phocæans in their country, are the firſt men- " tioned in hiſtory, we have reaſon to believe " that they pervaded Europe with their migrating " armies in a more remote period of antiquity." And ſurely theſe two repreſentations will not mingle and unite together. The introduction of an improved agriculture by the Grecians either was or was not, in Mr. Macpherſon's opinion, the original and remotely efficient cauſe of the Gallic migrations. If it was, Mr. Macpherſon can have no reaſon to believe, that the Gauls pervaded Europe with their migrating armies in a remoter period of Antiquity. And if it was not, the great and ſudden effect, which it is here deſcribed to have had upon the manners of the Gauls, is all a deluſion and viſion.

This hiſtory of the Pelaſgian refinements imported into Gaul, and producing migrations from it, is given us in order to account for the name of Celtæ being affixed to the general body of the Weſt-Europeans. And the migrations occaſioned by the improved ſtate of agriculture, are ſaid to have carried the colonies and the

name of the Gael or Celtæ over many of the regions of Europe. Yet "we have reaſon to "believe," as we are told in p. 9, "that the "Gauls pervaded Europe with their migrating "armies in a more remote period of antiquity." And therefore, according to Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, they muſt equally, in a more remote period, have planted the colonies and the name of the Celtæ in many of the regions of Europe.

Thus does this ingenious writer go on, apparently counteracting his own purpoſes and refuting his own poſitions. And I wreſt nothing. I wiſh to give every paſſage its full import. And I deſire to put an end to the examination, when I ceaſe to proſecute it with candour.

P. 9. "The appellation of Celtæ — is an "adjective derived from Gael, the aboriginal "name of the inhabitants of ancient Gaul."

I feel a little reluctance in myſelf to enter the field of Celtic etymology with Mr. Macpherſon. A gentleman, who was bred, I apprehend, in the boſom of the Highlands, an author, who, as the tranſlator of Oſſian, muſt certainly be converſant with the beſt and oldeſt writers in the Erſe, ſhould naturally command ſuch a clear and extenſive view of the language, its principles, and its genius, as to deter any mere Engliſhman

from the unequal conteſt. But, to be deterred by ſuch reaſons, is to betray an ignorance in the workings of the human heart. A conſciouſneſs of ſuperior knowledge, in any department of literature, almoſt always ſeduces a writer into a careleſſneſs and injudiciouſneſs in the exertion of it.

In the Hiſtory of Mancheſter I have endeavoured to inveſtigate the origin of the name of Celtæ. I have there proved it, I think, not to be an adjective derived from Gael, but to be equally a ſubſtantive, and actually the ſame word, with it. And, as it is neceſſary for the ſolution of the preſent difficulty, and will be ſerviceable for the diſcuſſion of ſome future doubts, I ſhall here go over the argument again, and contract it into a ſmaller compaſs.—The Iriſh and the Highlanders reciprocally denominate themſelves by the general title of Cael, Gael, or Gauls. They alſo diſtinguiſh themſelves, as the Welſh originally did, and as the Welſh diſtinguiſh them both at preſent, by the appellation of Guidhil, Guæthel, and Gathel. And this is certainly the origin of the other. The intermediate TH being left quieſcent in the pronunciation, as it is in many words of the Britiſh language, Gathel would immediately be formed into Gael. And Gathel is actually ſounded like Gael by both the Iriſh and the Highlanders at preſent. The appellation of Gathel therefore

was originally the ſame with Gael, and the parent of it. But this is not all. The quieſcent letters in Britiſh are frequently transferred from the middle to the concluſion of the word, where they are no longer quieſcent; and as Needle is popularly changed into Neeld in Lancaſhire, and Kathair is formed into Carth and Garth, ſo Gathel is changed into Galath, Galat, Galt, and Celt. And we ſee the fact directly exemplified in the Gael of the Continent being univerſally denominated Galatæ and Celtæ by the Grecians, and Gallt and Gallta by the Iriſh. The appellations therefore of Gathel-i, Gall-i, Galat-æ, Calet-es, An-Calit-es, and Celt-æ, are all one and the ſame denomination, only varied by the aſtoniſhing ductility of the Celtic, and only diſguiſed by the alterations ever incident to a language that has been merely oral for ages [1].

P. 8, 9. In conſequence of the Phocæan ſettlement at Marſeilles, "Spain, Italy,—and the Britiſh "Iſles were filled with colonies from Gaul, in "whom the old inhabitants, if they differed ori-"ginally from the Gael, were loſt."

And in p. 26, where the ſame ſubject is retouched, Mr. Macpherſon ſpeaks thus.—"The

[1] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 437—439.

"Umbri

"Umbri, who were the moſt ancient inhabi-
"tants of Italy (Umbrorum gens antiquiſſima
"Italiæ exiſtimatur. Plin. lib. iii. Umbri anti-
"quiſſimus Italiæ populus. Flor. lib. i.), were
"the poſterity of Gauls who penetrated into
"that country long before the commencement
"of hiſtory (Bocchus abſolvit Gallorum veterum
"propaginem Umbros eſſe. Solin. lib. viii. Umbri
"prima veterum Gallorum proles. Auguſt. in
"Sempron. Umbros veterum Gallorum eſſe pro-
"paginem Marcus Antonius refert. Servius in
"Æneid. xii.). We may naturally ſuppoſe that
"the Gauls of Belgium would have found leſs dif-
"ficulty in croſſing a very narrow channel into
"Britain than their countrymen at the foot of
"the Alps in clambering, with their wives and
"children, over the vaſt ridge of mountains
"which ſeparated them from Italy. It may
"therefore be concluded, that Britain received
"very conſiderable colonies from the Belgic di-
"viſion of Gaul as early, at leaſt, as the Gael of
"the Alpin regions ſeized upon Italy under the
"name of Umbri."

In theſe paſſages are contained two aſſertions concerning the firſt population of Britain, one urged as probably true, and the other produced as certainly ſo. According to the former, the natives of Gaul ſettled in Italy, under the name of Umbri, long before the commencement of hiſtory, and may therefore be concluded to have tranſ-

ported themſelves as early into Britain. And the latter declares the Britiſh Iſles to have received a colony of the Celtæ, in conſequence of the Phocæan ſettlement at Marſeilles. I ſhall conſider both of theſe attentively.

The opinion here advanced by Mr. Macpherſon, concerning the Umbri, has been advanced by ſeveral writers before, in that ſtrange humour which has been taken up by ſo many antiquarians, of magnifying the glory and extending the poſſeſſions of the Celtæ. But the notion appears to be chimerical and groundleſs.

The Umbri are affirmed by both Pliny and Florus, as Mr. Macpherſon himſelf has quoted them, to be the moſt antient people in Italy, or, in other words, to be the progeny of the firſt coloniſts that came into it after the flood. And if the Umbri were a race of men derived from Gaul, Gaul muſt have been inhabited ſome ages before Italy. So acceſſible as the latter is acroſs the ſea from Dalmatia or from Germany by land, and therefore lying much more obvious than Gaul to the great colonies of the Noachidæ, as they converged to the Weſt; it muſt, according to this repreſentation, have never received any colony at all, till Gaul diſcharged its ſuperfluous numbers into it. A country that muſt have peculiarly invited the ſpreading hords of the Eaſt, as puſhing its whole length in one vaſt projection into the waves of the Mediterranean, and therefore

fore lying very happily central betwixt the three great diviſions of the globe, is here ſuppoſed to have continued totally wild and deſolate, even for ages after Gaul was inhabited, till the Celtæ had gradually ſpread themſelves over all Gaul, till they began to increaſe in numbers, till they were obliged to diffuſe themſelves into other countries, and till they were compelled even "to clamber, with their wives and children, over "the vaſt ridge of mountains which ſeparated "them from Italy." This is ſuch an account, as confronts every ſuggeſtion of reaſon, and outrages every principle of propriety. The bands, that filed through the foreſts of Germany into Gaul, muſt equally have found their way through the vallies of the Tyroleſe into Italy. The tribes, that coaſted from Greece or Dalmatia into Gaul, muſt previouſly have landed upon the ſhore of Italy. As the great tide of European population rolled directly from the plains of Shinar to the verge of the Atlantic, in the natural courſe of cauſes and effects, no country could have been primarily inhabited from the Weſt. And Italy peculiarly could not, open as it is on the Eaſt and its collateral points, having its northern mountains remarkably pierced with a valley through the whole breadth of them, and being compleatly cloſed up and barricaded by its natural ramparts on the North-Weſt, the only point in which it borders upon Gaul. As

the natives of Gaul therefore can never be admitted to have been the firſt planters of Italy, the Umbri can never be allowed to have been originally a colony from Gaul. And Mr. Macpherſon muſt either deny the Umbri to have been the moſt antient people of Italy, or admit them not to have been originally derived from Gaul.

This reaſoning is ſufficient to counterbalance the aſſertions of ſuch authors, as Mr. Macpherſon has produced in ſupport of the opinion. And the reaſoning is happily confirmed by an hiſtorian of the moſt reſpectable character, and with whom, in a comparative eſtimate of authenticity and knowledge, Mr. Macpherſon's writers are but mere flutterers in the regions of hiſtory. Livy aſſerts the firſt and earlieſt migration of the Gauls to have been only in the reign of the elder Tarquin, and about 600 years before Chriſt. And he is uncommonly accurate and circumſtantial in his account. Gallos—eos qui oppugnaverunt Cluſium non fuiſſe qui primi Alpes tranſierint, ſatis conſtat. Ducentis quippe annis antequam Cluſium oppugnarent urbemque Romam caperent, in Italiam Galli tranſcenderunt.—De tranſitu in Italiam Gallorum hæc accepimus. Priſco Tarquinio Romæ regnante,—Bellovefo—in Italiam viam Dii dederunt.—Profectus ingentibus peditum equitumque copiis, in Tricaſtinos venit. Alpes inde oppoſitæ erant, quas inexſuperabiles viſas haud equidem miror, nullâ dum

viâ

viâ (quod quidem continens memoria ſit, niſi de Hercule fabulis credere libet) ſuperatas. Croſſing the Alps, fuſiſque acie Tuſcis, haud procul Ticino flumine—condidere urbem, Mediolanum appellarunt. Alia ſubinde manus, — Elitovio duce, — favente Belloveſo, quum tranſcendiſſet Alpes, ubi nunc Brixia ac Verona urbes ſunt—conſidunt. Poſt hos Salluvii — circa Ticinum amnem —. Deinde Boii Lingones —, quum jam inter Padum atque Alpes omnia tenerentur, Pado ratibus trajecto, non Etruſcos modò, ſed etiam Umbros, agro pellunt. Tum Senones, recentiſſimi advenarum, attacked Cluſium and burnt Rome [1]. And the regular detail of ſuch an hiſtorian fixes the point beyond all poſſibility of doubt. The Gauls firſt entered Italy about the year 600 before Chriſt, when the country was compleatly inhabited from end to end.

But the authors quoted by Mr. Macpherſon have been wronged in the application by him. The Umbri might be the deſcendants of antient Gauls, and even the firſt inhabitants of Italy; and yet not be derivatives from Gaul. As the great body of the Celtæ puſhed by land or coaſted by ſea for the ſeat of their future Empire in Gaul, a part of them might divide from the reſt, and make a ſettlement in Italy. And this appears, I think, to have been actually the caſe. That the Umbri were really Celtæ or Gauls, is

[1] L. v. c. 33—35.

aſſerted

aſſerted by ſuch authorities, as, however inſignificant in themſelves, we cannot in juſtice reject without a ſuperior authority to the contrary. And the remains of Celtic or Gallic appellations among the Umbri, is a ſtrong confirmation of their aſſertions. I ſhall mention only two, becauſe they muſt both have been prior to any migration of colonies from Gaul. And theſe are their own national and original appellation of Umbri, and the ſimilar appellation of their originally principal river, the Umbrio, both evidently the ſame with the Umbri and the Humber in Britain; the generical appellation of the Celtæ in Italy and in this iſland being communicated by both to a great æſtuary or river in their country, and our Humber being therefore written and pronounced Chumber formerly [1].

A migration then from Gaul into Italy, before the reign of Tarquin the Firſt, is precluded by the poſitive voice of hiſtory. And all inferences derived from the ſuppoſition muſt equally fall with it to the ground. A migration from Gaul into Britain, as early at leaſt as the other, is inferred from it by Mr. Macpherſon. And the concluſion is reaſonable in itſelf. But the premiſes have been here proved to be falſe. And Mr. Macpherſon muſt refer his firſt colony from Gaul to the æra of the Phocæan eſtabliſhment in it.

[1] Carte, vol. i. p. 17.

The

The former opinion was given to us only as probable. This is preſented as certain. And it challenges for its ſupport the authority of Cæſar and the teſtimony of Tacitus. Tacitus is quoted thus, In univerſum tamen æſtimanti Gallos vicinum ſolum occupaſſe, credibile eſt; and Cæſar thus, Britanni non multum a Gallicâ differunt conſuetudine. But one of theſe authorities is not quoted fairly. The latter, which is here applied to the Britons in oppoſition to the Belgæ [1], and has the word Britanni added to it in order to make it applicable, actually relates to the Belgæ in oppoſition to the Britons, is actually referred to the Belgæ by Mr. Macpherſon himſelf in p. 33, and actually relates only to the Belgæ of Kent. And even if both theſe paſſages were fairly quoted, they very obviouſly determine neither the fact nor the period of the Gallic ſettlement in Gaul. They prove indeed the very high probability of a Gallic colony originally ſettling in the iſland: but they evince not the certainty of it. And they do not give us the leaſt intimation concerning the particular æra of the ſettlement. Mr. Macpherſon, deriving the ſettlement in a long conſecution of cauſes and effects from the Phocæan eſtabliſhment in Gaul, fixes the æra one or two centuries after the eſtabliſhment, and about 400 or 500 years before Chriſt. But Mr. Macpherſon alſo fixes the æra

[1] See 2d and 3d Sections of this chapter.

exactly

exactly at the period of that eſtabliſhment, as he ranks the migration into Britain coæval with the expedition into Italy. Tacitus and Cæſar, however, lend not the ſmalleſt ſanction to either part of Mr. Macpherſon's chronology. And, even if Mr. Macpherſon's authority could be of any moment on a ſubject of this nature, its own contradictorineſs muſt deſtroy itſelf.

This is the whole of Mr. Macpherſon's argument with reſpect to the coming of the firſt coloniſts into Britain. And I am ſorry to obſerve on reviewing the whole, that, in the progreſs of the argument, Mr. Macpherſon ſeems to be unhappy in every movement. And the period and the fact of a Gallic colony originally ſettling in Britain, which are the firſt great points in Mr. Macpherſon's hiſtorical ſyſtem, are left abſolutely doubtful and undetermined.—But as theſe are two particulars of ſome conſequence in the hiſtory of Britain, the great deſign of the preſent work, to enlighten the dark period of its earlier annals, naturally leads me to endeavour to aſcertain them. It muſt be hazardous indeed to attempt, where Mr. Macpherſon has failed. But it can be no diſgrace to be baffled, where even he has been unſucceſsful.

The

The derivation of the Britons from the Gauls does not depend, as Tacitus and Cæsar have placed it, upon any precarious reasonings from the vicinity of the two countries and a similarity in the two nations. It may be grounded upon better principles. And it is clearly demonstrated by the national appellation of Gaul, which I have already shewn in part, and shall fully shew hereafter, to have been formerly, or to be at present, retained by the British inhabitants in every quarter of the island. This proof is equally short and decisive. But the period, in which the Gauls first crossed the channel into Britain, is much more difficult to be ascertained. It may, I think, be settled in this manner.

The first migration of the Gauls that is recorded by history, as I have already shewn, was made in the reign of the elder Tarquin and about the year 600 before Christ. This was a double one, an expedition into Italy, and an invasion of Germany [1]. And this was clearly after Britain had been peopled by the Gauls. As long as the Gauls had a vent for their growing numbers into the uninhabited regions of Spain or of Britain, they could not have been obliged to turn back upon their progenitors behind them. The great current of European population, which had fallen for ages into the West, could not have been compelled to return upon itself, till it had

[1] Livy, l. v. c. 33.

filled

filled the whole extent of its intended channel, and till it found itſelf ſtopt in its progreſs by inſuperable barriers. And the Gauls would certainly not have choſen to enter Italy and invade Germany, where they were ſure to encounter oppoſition, and where their ſettlements muſt be precarious from the uncertainty of their ſucceſs, and expoſed to danger from the remoteneſs of their countrymen; when all the region of Britain, in particular, lay open to them, was ready to receive their colonies, and by its daily appearance to the eye ſeemed actually to invite them into it. At this period, therefore, the iſland of Britain was certainly inhabited. And it muſt have been inhabited long before.

When the Gauls firſt began to diſcharge their numbers into Britain, the iſland would naturally ſerve as the great reſervoir of the continent for ages. Gradually as the people multiplied to be troubleſome, they would all find a ſafe and eaſy conveyance into Britain. And Gaul could not begin to be overburdened with her progeny, till the population of Britain was nearly compleated, till the uninhabited parts of the iſland were too remote from the continent, or till the iſlanders were obliged, in their own defence, to forbid any future migrations into the country. This muſt have been the actual ſtate of population in Britain, for ſome time before the expeditions of Belloveſus and Sigoveſus from Gaul. And freſh colo-

colonies, for ſome time before, muſt have ceaſed to find their way into Britain. The tribes of Gaul were now pent up within their own continent. And as the multiplication continued, and all the former reſources were exhauſted, they were obliged at laſt to recoil upon the more eaſterly colonies, to explore an unpractiſed way over the ſnows and mountains of the Alps, and to open to themſelves a new receptacle among the inhabitants of Italy and Germany. A long time therefore muſt have elapſed, before the ſuperfluous numbers of Gaul could have filled up the greater part of the iſland, and could have any occaſion to prohibit the entrance of any more into it. And ſome time muſt have intervened, before the effect of this prohibition could have appeared upon the continent, and more, before it could have burſt out in the great and neceſſary migrations into Germany and Italy. Four or five centuries muſt have paſſed betwixt the commencement of population in the iſland, and the æra of thoſe migrations on the continent. And the poſition is ſtrikingly confirmed to us by the parallel hiſtory of Ireland, this iſland in a later period ſerving equally as a drain to Britain, and the population of it not being compleated in leſs than 500 years [1].

This reaſoning ſettles the firſt inhabitation of Britain about 1000 years before Chriſt. About

[1] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 433—437. and 440—442.

1000

1000 years before Chriſt it is actually fixed by ſome of Richard's authorities: A. M. 3000, circa hæc tempora cultam & habitatam primùm Britanniam arbitrantur nonnulli [1]. And about 1000 years before Chriſt the progreſs of population, as far as it can be traced in the iſland, concurs with the argument to ſettle it [2]. From the one reaſon it may be concluded, that the iſland was firſt inhabited no leſs than this number of years before the Chriſtian æra. And from the other it appears highly probable, that the iſland could not have been inhabited many more before it. And the coincidence of two ſuch arguments, that derived from the ſtate of population on the continent, and this deduced from the progreſs of population in the iſland, the concurrence of both with the authorities of hiſtory, and the convergence of all to one common point of time, give us as much certainty on the ſubject, as we muſt ever expect in enquiries of this very remote nature, and fix the firſt migration of the Gauls into Britain, with as much preciſion as the difficulties of the queſtion will admit, about a thouſand years before the coming of our Saviour, or about the reigns of David and Solomon among the Jews.

[1] P. 50. [2] Hiſt. of Manch. p. 7. and 466.

II.

II.

CONCERNING THE SECOND COLONY THAT MR. MACPHERSON BRINGS INTO BRITAIN.

PAG. 10. "The domeſtic improvements "which, in the beginning of their progreſs "in Gaul, enabled the inhabitants of that coun- "try to overrun the regions of the Weſt and "North, had arrived at ſome degree of maturity "long before the Romans penetrated beyond "the Alps. Inſtead of wandering in ſearch of "foreign ſettlements, the Gauls found it more "convenient to cultivate thoſe which they al- "ready poſſeſſed. The ſpirit of conqueſt re- "tired further towards the North; and the "tide of migration, which had for ages flowed "from Gaul, returned upon itſelf —. The Ger- "man Celtæ repaſſed the Rhine."

The improvements in agriculture are here, and in p. 8, ſaid to have conſequentially occaſioned the migrations of the Gauls. But here they are equally ſaid to have put an end to them. And the ſame natural cauſe has two different and contra-

dictory effects attributed to it.—The improvements in agriculture are declared to have occasioned migrations in the beginning of their progress, and in their advancement towards maturity to have given an absolute termination to them. And the same natural cause, that in its weaker and commencing operations produced one effect, in its stronger and more perfect influence produced another and the opposite.—All this, I think, is clearly asserted together in the present extract. "The domestic improvements —, in the "beginning of their progress in Gaul, enabled "the inhabitants — to overrun the regions of "the West and North —." When they "had "arrived at some degree of maturity —, instead "of wandering in search of foreign settlements, "the Gauls found it more convenient to culti-"vate those which they already possessed."—Nor is this all the inconsistency which this extract seems to contain. Those improvements, which in their infant state impelled the Gauls to relinquish their country, in their maturer condition not only induced them to stay at home, but even brought foreign emigrants into the country. "The tide of migration, which had "for ages flowed from Gaul, returned upon it-"self."

That multiplied population, which was the immediate consequence of the commencing improvements in agriculture, obliged the Gauls to dis-

charge

charge themſelves in colonies into the neighbouring countries. That infinitely greater population, which muſt have equally reſulted from the improvements being more generally diffuſed, more experimentally known, and conſiderably heightened in their influence, and which muſt have obliged the Gauls, in an infinitely greater degree, to diſcharge themſelves into the neighbouring regions; this, it ſeems, did not oblige them at all, this actually prevailed upon them to ſtay at home, and this abſolutely invited others into the country. Thus does this lively and valuable writer again ſeem to be engaged at croſs purpoſes with his own argument.

P. 11, 12. "More than three centuries prior "to the Chriſtian æra, the German Celtæ, "under the name of Cimbri, ravaged all the "regions lying between the Rhine and the Ionian "ſea (Hæ ſunt nationes quæ tam longè ab ſuis "ſedibus Delphos profectæ ſunt. Cicero pro "Fonteio, xx.)."

The paſſage, here cited by Mr. Macpherſon, actually ſtands in a ſtriking oppoſition to his doctrine. It refers not to the Cimbri, or German Celtæ, at all. It refers ſolely and abſolutely to the Proper Celtæ, or the natives of Gaul. —Cicero, vindicating the conduct of Fronteius in

his government of Gaul, Provinciæ Galliæ M. Fronteius præfuit, and, like a mere advocate, catching at the popular prejudices of the Romans, says thus of the Gallic tribes. Hæ sunt nationes quæ tam longè ab suis sedibus Delphos usque, ad Apollinem Pythium atque ad oraculum orbis terræ vexandum ac spoliandum, profectæ sunt. *Ab iisdem gentibus — obsessum est Capitolium.* Here we see no mention of the Cimbri, and no intimation concerning the German Celtæ. All that is said is spoken merely of the real and absolute Gauls, of those who sacked Rome as well as plundered Delphi. And Mr. Macpherson's quotation, not only does not prove the spirit of conquest to have retired from Gaul towards the North, and the German Celtæ to have ravaged all the regions lying between the Rhine and the Ionian Sea; but actually evinces the contrary, shews the spirit at this period to have been still very active in Gaul, and appropriates these ravages to the Native Celtæ.

P. 28, 29. "The spirit of conquest passing "from the Gauls to the Celto-Germanic colonies "beyond the Rhine, the latter pervaded Europe "with their armies (Cimbri magnam Europæ nec "exiguam Asiæ partem sibi tributariam fecere "agrosque debellatorum a se occuparunt. Diod. "Sic. lib. v.). — The German posterity of the "Gauls,

" Gauls, under the name of Cimbri, traverſed " the vaſt regions between their own country " and the ſea of Ionia (Cimbri contractis undique " copiis, ad Ionicum mare converſi, gentem Illy- " riorum, et quicquid gentium ad Macedonas " uſque habitat, imo ipſos Macedonas oppreſsere. " Pauſ. Attic. iv.). About half a century after " the death of Alexander, they poured irreſiſti- " ble armies into Greece, Thrace, and Mace- " donia — (Gens aſpera, audax, bellicoſa, domi- " tis Pannoniis, et hortante deinde ſucceſſu, divi- " ſis agminibus, alii Græciam, alii Macedoniam, " omnia ferro proterentes, petivere. Juſtin. lib. " xxiv.). — Some of them, paſſing the Propon- " tis, filled the leſſer Aſia with their colonies " (Tantæ fœcunditatis juventus, ut Aſiam omnem " velut examine aliquo implerent. Juſtin, " lib. xxv.); and ſpread the terror of their name " far and wide by the invincible fortune of " their arms (Tantus terror nominis et armorum " invicta felicitas. Juſtin, lib. xxv.). The irrup- " tion of the Cimbri was not merely depredatory. " They left colonies in their conquered countries " (Agros debellatorum a ſe occuparunt. Diod. " Sic. lib. v.)."

I have cited this paſſage immediately after the former, that Mr. Macpherſon's argument may enjoy the full force of the authorities produced in its favour. And, in both theſe extracts, by the ſame

over-ruling influence the Germans are regularly ſubſtituted for the Gauls. They were the natives of Gaul, and not the reſidents of Germany, who more than 300 years prior to the Chriſtian æra, as the preceding paſſage fixes the time, or about half a century after the death of Alexander, as the preſent more accurately, though contradictorily, fixes it, ravaged all the country to the ſea of Ionia. In the year 279 before Chriſt, the Gauls ſent out three armies, which ravaged Pannonia, Greece, Macedonia, and Aſia, plundered, or attempted to plunder, the temple at Delphi, and ſettled colonies in ſome of thoſe countries. And even the authorities, here cited to confine theſe actions to the Germans, all concur to appropriate them to the Gauls. This muſt ſeem very ſtrange. But it is actually true.

Diodorus, ſpeaking expreſsly of the Gauls, but conſidering them as extended *εξης μεχρι της Σκυθιας*, ſays thus. *Hi — ſunt qui Romam ceperunt. Hi templum in Delphis expilarunt.* Hi magnam Europæ partem, &c. *Ουτοι εισιν οι την μεν Ρωμην ελοντες, το δε ιερον το εν Δελφοις συλησαντες, και πολλην μεν της Ευρωπης, ουκ ολιγην δε και της Ασιας, φορολογησαντες· οι δια την προς τους Ελληνας επιπλοκην* ΕΛΛΗΝΟ-ΓΑΛΑΤΑΙ *κληθεντες.* Thoſe therefore who reduced a conſiderable part of Europe, and no inconſiderable portion of Aſia, and ſettled on the lands

lands of the conquered, were not Cimbri, though Mr. Macpherſon has unwarily interpolated the name in his quotation; were not Germans, as Mr. Macpherſon has arbitrarily interpreted his own inſerted name of Cimbri to mean; but were Gauls, the ſame that took Rome, the ſame that plundered Delphi, and the ſame that were denominated Gallo-Græci.

Pauſanias in his Attica ſays thus. *Galli* — in extremis Europæ oris ad vaſtum mare accolunt. — Verùm ut *Galli* appellarentur, non niſi ſerò uſus obtinuit. *Celtas* enim, quum ipſi ſe antiquitus, tum alii eos, nominarunt. *Hi* contractis undecunque copiis, ad Ionicum mare converſi, &c. Οι δε ΓΑΛΑΤΑΙ — νεμονται της Ευρωπης τα εσχατα επι θαλασσῃ πολλῃ — ὁψε δε ποτε αυτους καλεισθαι ΓΑΛΑΤΑΣ εξενικησε· ΚΕΛΤΟΙ γαρ κατα τε σφας το αρχαιον, και παρα τοις αλλοις, ωνομαζοντο. Συλλεγεισα δε ΣΦΙΣΙ στρατια τρεπεται την επι Ιονιου, καὶ το τε Ιλλυριων εθνος, και παν οσον αχρι Μακεδονων ῳκει, και Μακεδονας αυτους, αναστατους εποιησε. And here Mr. Macpherſon appears in his quotation to have inadvertently dropt the words Galli and Celtæ, and to have planted the word Cimbri in their place. Pauſanias does not aſſert the German poſterity of the Gauls to have ravaged the country up to the ſea of Ionia. And Pauſanias does not aſſert any nation to have committed theſe ravages under the name of Cimbri. He declares the Gauls, and the Gauls only, to have

made this expedition. And he declares them to have paſſed under their own indigenous denominations of Galli and Celtæ.

Juſtin is the other author here quoted. And he is ſtill more expreſsly againſt the purpoſe for which Mr. Macpherſon has produced him. He ſays thus, *Galli*, abundanti multitudine, *cùm eos non caperent terræ quæ genuerant*, ad ſedes novas quærendas velut ver ſacrum miſerunt. *Ex his* portio in Italiâ conſedit, *quæ et urbem Romanam captam incendit*, et portio Illyricos ſinus — per ſtrages barbarorum penetravit, & in Pannoniâ conſedit; gens aſpera, audax, bellicoſa —. Hortante deinde ſucceſſu, diviſis agminibus, alii Græciam, alii Macedoniam, omnia ferro proterentes, petivere. Tantuſque terror *Gallici* nominis erat, ut — ſolus rex Macedoniæ Ptolemæus adventum *Gallorum* intrepidus audivit. — Igitur *Galli*, duce Belgio, attacked and defeated Ptolemy. — Interea Brennus, quo duce portio *Gallorum* in Græciam ſe effuderat, auditâ victoriâ ſuorum qui Belgio duce Macedonas vicerant, — Delphos iter vertit [1]. And in another place Juſtin ſays thus. *Gallorum* eâ tempeſtate tantæ fœcunditatis juventus fuit, ut Aſiam omnem velut examine aliquo implerent. Denique, neque reges Orientis ſine mercenario *Gallorum* exercitu ulla bella geſſerunt, neque,

[1] L. xxiv. c. 4, 5, 6.

puſi

pulſi regno, ad alios quam ad *Gallos* confugerunt. Tantus terror *Gallici* nominis et armorum invicta felicitas [1]. And here Mr. Macpherſon appears, in the ſame ſtrain of inadvertency that is noticed before, to have left out the word Gallorum in one of his quotations, and Gallici in another, and to have applied all three in direct oppoſition to the expreſs and repeated meaning of the whole. The armies which Juſtin here deſcribes as pouring into Thrace, Greece, and Macedonia, he does not aſſert to have been Germans, and he does not affirm to have been denominated Cimbri. He explicitly declares them to have been Gauls. He directly derives them from their native country of Gaul. And he repeatedly makes them to have been a part of that national body, which took the city of Rome, and marched to plunder the temple of Delphi.

Each of theſe long extracts reflects a light upon the other. And from the united luſter of all we may clearly ſee, that Mr. Macpherſon has been ſtrangely led away by his own prejudices, has preſſed into his cauſe arguments that are all in a natural combination againſt him, and, in a ſpirit of involuntary piracy, is even fighting under falſe colours. The total omiſſion of ſome expreſſions that muſt have diſproved the application of the paſſages, the careful diſcharge of

[1] L. xxv. c. 2.

all

all hoſtile words from the quotations, and the officious interpolation of friendly in their room, facts that appear evident upon the face of the extracts above, certainly give an unhappy aſpect of diſingenuouſneſs to the whole, and may ſeem to diſcredit the integrity and honour of Mr. Macpherſon. But any one that has felt in his own breaſt the prevailing bias of either ſyſtematical or national prejudices, and can therefore make the proper allowance for the force of both together, will eaſily acquit Mr. Macpherſon of any intentional frauds, and will refer all to its immediate cauſe, to prepoſſeſſions which have enſlaved the ſtrongeſt intellects, and to weakneſſes which are the groundwork of all the patriot virtues.

P. 10—12. "The German Celtæ (Celtæ ſive "Galli quos Cimbros vocant. Appian, in Illyr. "—) repaſſed the Rhine, committed terrible "devaſtations, and — extended their conqueſts "to Spain—. The Luſitanians, according to "Diodorus Siculus, were the moſt warlike branch "of the Cimbri (αλκιμωτατοι μεν εισι οι καλεμενοι "Αυσιτανοι. Diod. Sic. lib. v.)."

Here we meet with the ſame ſtrain of falſe quotation, as we have already remarked in the preceding articles. — The paſſage in Appian, which is here applied to the German Celtæ, belongs

longs to the Native Gauls in the original. Eoſdem [Autarios] *Celtaſque*, quos Cimbros vocant, *ad Delphos poſuiſſe caſtra : αὐτὰς δὲ* ΚΕΛΤΟΙΣ, *τοὺς* Κιμβρους *λεγομένους*, ΕΠΙ ΔΕΛΦΟΙΣ ΣΥΣΤΡΑΤΕΥΣΑΙ [1]. The Gauls, we ſee, who are ſaid to have been denominated Cimbri, were actual Proper Celtæ, and were abſolutely the very Gauls that encamped againſt the temple of Delphi.—And the paſſage here cited from Diodorus, to prove the Luſitanians a branch of the Cimbri, is equally cited by Mr. Macpherſon only four pages before, to prove the Luſitanians a branch of the Galli, and has actually no reference to either. This is as aſtoniſhing as it is evident. Speaking of the migrations of the Galli, or Proper Celtæ, in p. 6—10, and of the much later migrations of the Cimbri, or German Celtæ, in p. 10—12, Mr. Macpherſon in p. 8 aſſerts Spain to have been filled with a colony from Gaul, as he here aſſerts it to have received another from Germany, and actually brings the ſame paſſage of hiſtory as a proof of both. When he is to evince the Cimbric or Celto-Germanic ſettlement from it, as here and in p. 30, he quotes it thus, *αλκιμώταοι μεν εισι οι καλεμενοι Λυσιτανοι*, and, omnium *Cimbrorum* fortiſſimi ſunt Luſitani. But when he is to prove the Gallic, he cites it thus, *αλκιμώταοι μεν* ΤΩΝ ΓΑΛΑΤΩΝ *οι καλεμενοι Λυσιτανοι*. Mr.

[1] P. 1106. Amſtel. 1670.

Macpherſon's

Macpherſon's prejudices and inadvertency throw any colour over the paſſage, which the nature of the preſent argument calls for. The ſame portion of hiſtory is adduced by Mr. Macpherſon, and once only within four pages, to prove two abſolutely oppoſite points. It is adduced three times; and the principal word in the original, which would have vindicated the paſſage from the miſapplication, is ſtudiouſly omitted every time. And the main eſſential words in the quotation are twice interpolated, and are both times different. The paſſage, in ſhort, that has been thus applied to the Galli and the Cimbri, has not the leaſt connexion with either. It refers only to the Iberes: ΤΩΝ ΔΕ ΙΒΗΡΩΝ *αλκιμωτατοι μεν εισιν οι καλουμενοι Λυσιτανοι*, ſays Diodorus, all along diſtinguiſhing the Iberes from the Celtæ. And, to compleat this group of inaccuracies and contradictions, this very part of Diodorus's hiſtory is referred to by Mr. Macpherſon in p. 85 and 86, as containing an "expreſs teſtimony," that the Iberians were a "different people" from the Celtæ.

P. 10—12. "The German Celtæ (*Ιππευς δε "Γαλατης το γενος, η Κιμβρος*. Plutarch in Ma- "rio.) repaſſed the Rhine, committed terrible "devaſtations, and acquired a juſt title to the "name of Cimbri, which ſignifies a band of "robbers

" robbers (Κιμβρες επονομαζεσι Γερμανοι τες λῃσας. " Plutarch in Mario. λῃστρικοι ὀντες και πολεμικοι οι " Κιμβροι. Strabo, lib. vii.)[1]."

This irruption of the German Celtæ is fixed, as I have noted before, more than three centuries prior to the Chriſtian æra in p. 11; and in p. 28, about half a century after the death of Alexander, or about the year 273 before Chriſt. But, as a proof of the irruption, Mr. Macpherſon quotes the well-known paſſage of Plutarch, that relates the ſtory of a Gallic or Cimbric horſeman being ſent to murder Marius in the priſon of Minturnæ, and dropping his ſword with terror at the appearance, addreſs, and name of a man, that had made himſelf ſo formidable to his countrymen. Ιππευς—Γαλατης το γενος, η Κιμβρος, αμφοτερως γαρ ιστορειται[2]. But this paſſage evidently relates to that incurſion of the Cimbri, which happened near two centuries after either

[1] So Dr. Macpherſon interprets Cimbri, Robbers, and from the ſame incompetent authority, p. 112.

[2] V. II. p. 532. Bryan.—Valerius Maximus in his account of this incident ſays thus—Miſſus ad Marium occidendum in privatâ domo Minturnis claufum ſervus publicus, natione Cimber, et ſenem et inermem et ſqualore obſitum, ſtrictum gladium tenens, aggredi non ſuſtinuit, ſed claritate viri obcæcatus, abjecto ferro, attonitus inde ac tremens fugit. Cimbrica nimirum calamitas oculos hominis perſtrinxit, devictæque ſuæ gentis interitus animum comminuit: etiam Diis immortalibus indignum ratis, ab uno ejus Nationis interfici Marium, quam totam deleverat. L. ii. c. 10. §. 6. Delphin.

period,

period, which was made acroſs the Rhine about 112, and was terminated by Marius about 101, before the Chriſtian æra.

And the intimation here given, that the German Celtæ acquired the name of Cimbri after they had paſſed the Rhine, and after they had committed terrible devaſtations in Gaul, appeals for its authority to another paſſage of Plutarch, which ſays not, that the name was given on the Gallic ſide of the Rhine, but on the German, which ſays not, that the Gauls conferred the appellation upon them, but that the Germans uſually called a robber a Cimber. So much is the proof in oppoſition to the point!

P. 28, 29: "The German poſterity of the "Gauls, under the name of Cimbri,—cut to "pieces all the intermediate nations between "their original ſeats and the Helleſpont (Ex- "torres inopiâ agrorum, profecti domo, per aſ- "perrimam Illyrici oram, Pæoniam inde et "Thraciam, pugnando cum ferociſſimis genti- "bus, menſi has terras ceperunt. Livius, lib. "xxxviii.)."

I have produced this paſſage again with the new quotation annexed to it, to point out another inſtance of the ſtrange inaccuracy which runs through the preſent work.—In p. 24 we are

told, that " the Gael of the continent extended " their name with their arms into all the regions " of Europe ;" and we have this quotation to confirm it, " Ferox natio Gallorum pervagata " bello prope orbem terrarum. Livius, lib. " xxxviii." The former citation is brought to prove the irruptions of the Cimbri or German Celtæ, in oppoſition to the Gael or Native Celtæ. The latter is produced to prove the irruptions of the Gael or Native Celtæ, in contradiſtinction to the Cimbri or German Celtæ. And yet the two paſſages, that are thus applied to two different nations, are actually parts of one and the ſame account, and are directly ſpoken of one and the ſame people. The whole paſſage runs thus. Manlius in *Gallo-Græciâ* bellum geſſit—. *Hi Galli*,—ſeu inopiâ agri ſeu prædæ ſpe, nullam gentium, per quas ituri eſſent, parem rati, Brenno duce in Dardanos pervenerunt—.Non me præterit, Milites, ſays Manlius to his ſoldiery, omnium quæ Aſiam colunt gentium *Gallos* famâ belli præſtare. Inter mitiſſimum genus hominum ferox natio, pervagata bello propè orbem terrarum, ſedem cepit.—Semel primo congreſſu *ad Alliam olim fuderunt majores noſtros :* ex eo tempore per ducentos jam annos, pecorum in modum, conſternatos cædunt fugantque —. Et illis majoribus noſtris cum *haud dubiis Gallis in terrâ ſuâ genitis* res erat. Hi jam degeneres ſunt, mixti, et *Gallo-Græci* verè, quod appellantur.—

Extorres

Extorres inopiâ agrorum, profecti domo, per asperrimam Illyrici oram, Pæoniam inde et Thraciam, pugnando cum ferociſſimis gentibus, emenſi, has terras ceperunt. But now manſuefacta eſt feritas [1]. What Mr. Macpherſon has given in one place to the Native Gauls, and in another to the German Celtæ, relates only to the former, we ſee. And the inconſiſtency in the application is a remarkable inſtance of inattention in the author.

P. 10—12. "The German Celtæ (Celtæ ſive "Galli quos [Cimbros vocant. Appian. in Illyr. "Ιππευς δε Γαλατης το γενος, η Κιμβρος. Plutarch "in Mario.) repaſſed the Rhine, — acquired a "juſt title to the name of Cimbri, which ſignifies "a band of robbers (Κιμβρες επονομαζεσι Γερμανοι "τες λῃσας. Plutarch in Mario. λῃστικοι ονῃες "και πλανῃτες οι Κιμβροι. Strabo, lib. vii.)—, "and,—more than three centuries prior to the "Chriſtian æra,—extended their conqueſts to— "Great Britain. — And the Welſh retain, in "their name, an undoubted mark of their Cim- "bric extraction."

And in p. 30 thus— "When ſome of the "Cimbri appeared on the frontiers of Greece, "others drove the ancient Gael from the Belgic

[1] C. 12. 16, and 17.

"diviſion

"diviſion of Gaul—(reperiebat Cæſar Belgas "eſſe ortos ab Germanis Rhenum antiquitus tranſ- "ductos, propter loci fertilitatem ibi conſediſſe; "Galloſque qui ea loca incolerent, expuliſſe. "lib. ii.)."

I have brought theſe two paſſages together, in order to exhibit by both the whole of Mr. Macpherſon's aſſertions and authorities upon this ſubject. Mr. Macpherſon frequently goes over the ſame points again in the progreſs of his diſquiſition, and very ſtrangely neglects to give authorities for his aſſertions in the firſt inſtance, but produces them in the ſecond. And the three great particulars contained in the extracts are theſe, That the German Celtæ repaſſed the Rhine more than 300 or (p 28) about 270 years before Chriſt; That the name of Cimbri was peculiarly given on occaſion of this expedition into Gaul; and, That Cymri, the indigenous appellation of the Welſh at preſent, is a full proof of the German Celtæ having paſſed over in a large colony into Britain. Each ſhall be the ſubject of a diſtinct paragraph.

That the German Celtæ repaſſed the Rhine into Gaul at the one or the other of the periods mentioned above, is the firſt point in Mr. Macpherſon's deduction of his ſecond colony into Britain. It was this which gave the firſt motion to the great maſs of matter on the continent, and occaſioned thoſe vibrations that were ſo ſen-

ſibly felt into the iſland. And yet, by a ſtrange unhappineſs, the alledged fact does not carry the ſmalleſt appearance of a proof where it is firſt mentioned, and carries only the appearance of one where it is mentioned again. The four firſt quotations are not intended to authenticate the fact at all. Two of them only aſſert the Gauls to have been denominated Cimbri, and the others only intimate the Cimbri of Germany to have been actually robbers. But none of the four in the leaſt aſſerts the remigration of the German Celtæ into Gaul at this period. And in p. 30 the only authority for the fact is the paſſage from Cæſar, which runs thus in the original: Reperiebat pleroſque Belgas eſſe ortos a Germanis; Rhenumque antiquitus tranſductos, propter loci fertilitatem ibi conſediſſe; Galloſque qui ea loca incolerent expuliſſe. But this is no proof, any more than the quotations before, that the German Celtæ repaſſed the Rhine at this period under the name of Cimbri. It ſhews not the Belgæ to have been German Celtæ at all. It ſhews not the Belgæ to have been ever denominated Cimbri. And it ſhews them not to have repaſſed the Rhine either 300 or 270 years before Chriſt. The Belgæ indeed croſſed the Rhine into Gaul many years before either of theſe periods, ſince they penetrated into Britain, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter, no leſs than 350 years before Chriſt. And the Belgæ certainly were not the

the people, that Mr. Macpherſon here intimates them to have been, and that they muſt have been if they were the ſame with Mr. Macpherſon's Cimbri. The Belgæ never "ravaged all "the regions lying between the Rhine and the "Ionian ſea," never "poured irreſiſtible armies "into Greece, Thrace, and Macedonia," never "cut to pieces all the intermediate nations be-"tween their original ſeats and the Helleſpont," never "filled the leſſer Aſia with their colonies," and never "extended their conqueſts into Spain." Theſe magnificent actions are attributed before to the German Celtæ in general, under the name of Cimbri. They are now attributed to that body of the Germans which was particularly denominated Belgæ. And I have previouſly demonſtrated that they belonged to neither, but were wholly the exploits of the Native Gauls or Proper Celtæ.

Nor was the name of Cimbri given to the Belgæ, on occaſion of their expedition back into Gaul. That the Belgæ ever bore the appellation, has not yet been proved by Mr. Macpherſon. And it was never the mere appropriated title of the German Celtæ in general, or of any diviſion of them in particular. It was the general and common denomination of the whole collective body of the Celtæ. And ſuch it appears very early on the continent. The natives and reſidents of Gaul, that I have previouſly ſhewn to

have broke into Greece, to have attacked Delphi, and to have ravaged Asia, these appear to have been denominated equally Galli, Celtæ, Cimmerii, or Cimbri. The Celtæ, who are called Cimbri, says Appian, encamped against Delphi: Κελτοις, τοις λεγομενοις Κιμβροις, επι Δελφοις συγκαθεσθαι [1]. Speaking of the Teutones and Cimbri, Plutarch says that the Cimmerii were first known to the Greeks in former ages, Κιμμεριων το μεν πρωτον υφ' Ελληνων των παλαι γνωσθεντων [2]. The Gauls, says Diodorus, who in antient times overran all Asia, were denominated Cimmerii: εν τοις παλαιοις χρονοις της Ασιαν απασαν καταδραμοντας, ονομαζομενους δε Κιμμεριους [3]. And the Galatæ of the Greeks, says Josephus, were formerly called Gomarians; τους μεν νυν υφ' Ελληνων Γαλατας καλουμενους, Γομαρεις λεγομενους [4]. The Celtæ of Germany therefore must, equally with the Celtæ of Greece and Asia, have carried the name into all the countries that they conquered. And it was not any appropriated distinction of the Celtæ in Germany or in Greece

[1] P. 1196. Amstel. [2] Vol. ii. p. 495.

[3] P. 355.

[4] Ant. lib. i. c. 7. And, in confirmation of this passage of Josephus, Mr. Pezron has very justly remarked, that several others of the antients have asserted the same, Eustathius of Antioch in his, Γαμερος εις Γαμαρεις, τους νυν Γαλατας, συνεγησεν—Jerom in his, Sunt autem Gomer, Galatæ—and Isidore in his, Gomer, ex quo Galatæ, id est, Galli.

from

from the Celtæ in Gaul. It was the ſtanding ſignature of the original derivation of both from the ſtock of the Cimmerii in Gaul. And it was obviouſly the firſt and original characteriſtic of that great national family, which was afterwards denominated Galli and Celtæ. Diſtinguiſhed by the epithets of Galli and Celtæ from their mode and manner of living, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter; they muſt naturally have been diſtinguiſhed before by ſome primæval and family appellation, by ſomething that carried the note of their deſcent from the great patriarch of their line. And ſuch appears to be the name of Cimmerii. Variouſly written Cimbri, Cimmerii, Cumri, Gumri, and Gomerite, it bears all the marks of an original and hereditary ſignature, and points fully, as it is expreſsly referred by hiſtory [1], to the patriarch Gomer. — The name therefore did not commence about three centuries before Chriſt. It had been a name for ages before that period. The denomination was not given to the German Celtæ by the Gauls, for their re-entrance into Gaul at that period, and as a mark of ignominy for their devaſtations in it. It was at that time the hereditary denomination of the Gauls themſelves. And the appellation was not borne by the Belgæ, or any or all of the German

[1] Joſephus Ant. lib. i. c. 7. The name is written Gumri by Llowarch Hên. in the ſixth century; ſee Lhuyd's Archæol.

Celtæ, as the appropriated name of the Germans; becauſe it was borne equally by the Gauls of Greece, the Gauls of Macedonia, and the Gauls of Aſia, and was the one comprehenſive title of all.

This directly accounts for the diſcovery of the ſame name in Britain, without calling in the extravagant and unwarranted ſuppoſition, that the Celtæ of North-Germany ſettled in the iſland. That this ſuppoſition is void of any ſupport in hiſtory, is obvious from the management of Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, who grounds it only on the name. "The Welſh," he ſays p. 13, "retain in their name an undoubted mark of their "Cimbric extraction." "In Britain," he ſays p. 30, "their very name remains, with their "blood, in the Cimbri of Wales." But I have already ſhewn the name to have not been the appropriated appellation of the German Celtæ, but the one univerſal title of the Gallic, the German, the Græcian, and the Aſiatic Gauls. The fixed indigenous denomination of the Gauls at home, it was carried with their colonies into the Eaſt, into Germany, and into Britain. The fixed indigenous appellation of the Gauls abroad, it was retained by them, equally as the general title of all and as the particular deſignation of ſome. Thus one third of the Gael on the Continent was particutarly denominated Galli, and one third of the Celtæ in Gaul was diſtinctively de-

nominated Celtæ, in the days of Cæſar[1]. And the Gauls of Aſia Minor were called Cimmerians, or Gomerites, in the days of Joſephus[2]. Thus, when all the German Celtæ were denominated Cimbri or Cambri, there was a nation of Si-Cambri upon the banks of the Rhine, and a tribe of Cimbri within the peninſula of Jutland[3]. And thus the common appellation of all the tribes of Britain, is ſtill retained by the deſcendants of three of them in Wales. The Welſh therefore preſerve no mark of their extraction from the German Celtæ, in their preſent denomination of Cymri. It is the ſign only of their original derivation from the Cimmerii of Gaul. And Mr. Macpherſon's whole ſcheme, of a Cimbric or Celto-Germanic eſtabliſhment in the iſland, appears to be entirely hypothetical and groundleſs.

P. 12, 13. "The firſt irruption of the nations "of the Northern Germany happened, as we "have already obſerved, more than three cen- "turies before the commencement of our preſent "æra. About two ages after, the Celtæ beyond "the Rhine threw another fleece of adventurers,

[1] P. 1. [2] Ant. lib. i. c. 7.
[3] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 427.

" under the name of Cimbri, into the regions of " the South (Sexcenteſimum & quadrageſimum " annum urbs noſtra agebat cùm Cimbrorum " audita ſunt arma. Tacit. Germ. 37.)."

I have produced this extract, merely to point out, how unfriendly and hoſtile Mr. Macpherſon's own quotations would be to his ſyſtem, if they were not a little garbled by him. — Of the two irruptions here aſſerted, the authority adduced for the latter entirely precludes the former. The paſſage is crippled in Mr. Macpherſon's quotation. In the original it runs thus. Proximi Oceano Cimbri, parva nunc civitas, ſed gloria ingens —. Sexcenteſimum et quadrageſimum annum urbs noſtra agebat, cùm *primùm* Cimbrorum audita ſunt arma. This therefore was the firſt irruption of the Cimbri into the South of Europe. And Mr. Macpherſon's own quotation, when it is reſtored to its original perfection, expreſsly declares it to have been the firſt.

THESE are all the parts of Mr. Macpherſon's great argument in favour of a German-Celtic colony ſettling in the iſland. And every part, we ſee, aſſerts ſome fact that is not true, or de-

duces

duces ſome reaſoning that is not juſt. The whole therefore is one ſyſtem of Error. And the exiſtence of a ſecond colony in Britain, as diſtinct from the Gael of the firſt and the Belgæ of the third, appears to be totally ungrounded. In all the arguments but one, Mr. Macpherſon has confounded the German with the Proper Celtæ, though the very ſcope and purpoſe of his arguments neceſſarily led him to diſtinguiſh accurately between them. And in that one Mr. Macpherſon has confounded the Cimbri with the Belgæ. Having accompanied the German Celtæ, or the Cimbri, in all their imaginary expeditions acroſs the continent of Europe, we find them at laſt dwindled down into the Belgæ, who had never been mentioned before, and to whom the preceding quotations, even as interpolated and garbled by Mr. Macpherſon's own inadvertency and prejudice, have not the ſmalleſt reference. Having through various pages engaged the Germans in incurſions which they never made, and in ravages which they never committed, Mr. Macpherſon at laſt attributes them to a ſmall body of the Germans, the Belgæ, whoſe only incurſion was from the German to the Gallic ſide of the Rhine, and whoſe only ravages were confined to a corner of Gaul. And the whole account, as the reader muſt already have obſerved, is ſupported by a train of the

moſt extraordinary inaccuracies, involuntary miſquotations, unintended perverſions, and miſtaken reaſonings, that perhaps ever occurred within ſo ſhort a compaſs, in the writings of a man of learning, taſte, and diſcernment.

III.

CONCERNING THE THIRD COLONY THAT MR. MACPHERSON BRINGS INTO BRITAIN.

PAG. 31. "The Cimbri who remained in "Gaul became [came] afterwards [after "the paſſage of others into Britain] to be diſtin- "guiſhed by the name of Belgæ. As that ap- "pellation carries reproach in its meaning, it is "likely that it was impoſed on that warlike "nation by the Gael whom they had expelled "from

" from their territories. Balge or Balgen, in " the ancient Celtic ſignified a ſpotted or party-" coloured herd, and, in a metaphorical ſenſe, " a mixed people, or an aggregate of many " tribes. The name alludes either to Belgium's " being peopled promiſcuouſly by the German " tribes, or to the unavoidable mixture of the " Celtic colonies beyond the Rhine with the " Sarmatæ of the Eaſt and North."

We are told before, in p. 10, " that the German " Celtæ re-paſſed the Rhine, committed terrible " devaſtations, and acquired a juſt title to the " name of Cimbri, which ſignifies a band of " robbers." And we are here told, that the Cimbri were diſtinguiſhed in Gaul by the name of Belgæ. The Gael, that had been expelled from their own territories, muſt have been the perſons that gave them the appellation of Cimbri or Robbers. And yet they are here repreſented as giving them the name of Belgæ. The former was a ſtrong brand upon their national character, and a lively mark of the reſentment of the injured Gael. And yet it is here ſuppoſed to have been ſuperſeded ſoon afterwards by a title from the ſame injured people, that carries little or no reproach with it. — But this derivation of the names of Cimbri and Belgæ is all as imaginary, as the reſting a momentous point of hiſtory upon ſuch precarious deductions is weak and trifling. The German Celtæ, as I have ſhewed before,

before, muſt neceſſarily have carried the name of Cimbri with them acroſs the Rhine into Germany, and have brought it with them into Gaul again. And the name of Belgæ appears not to have been given in Gaul, and ſeems to have been borne in Germany. Cæſar ſays, pleroſque Belgas eſſe ortos a Germanis, Rhenumque antiquitus tranſductos—ibi conſediſſe, Galloſque—expuliſſe: where we have not the leaſt intimation of any change in the name upon their paſſing into Gaul, and where they ſeem to have borne the ſame appellation on the German as on the Gallic ſide of the Rhine. And, wherever it was given or aſſumed, it was certainly no title of reproach, becauſe the Belgæ appear univerſally acknowledging it for their own on the Continent, in Britain, and in Ireland. This therefore entirely ſets aſide the indiſtinct and forced etymology of Mr. *Mac*pherſon, becauſe it carries a reproach in its meaning. And the name muſt be derived from ſome principle of diſtinction, that was admitted by the Belgæ as well as their neighbours, and will adapt itſelf to their condition either in Germany or in Gaul. The Belgæ pretty certainly lived, before their migration into Gaul, immediately on the German ſide of the Rhine. And as they and their neighbours muſt have been all equally Celtic [r], the name

[r] See hereafter for the Belgæ.

muſt

muſt have been derived from the Celtic language. They were a large aſſociation of tribes in Gaul, and muſt therefore have been the ſame in Germany [1]. They had ſeized no leſs than one third of all Gaul [2]: And they muſt therefore have been very conſiderable for their power in Germany. And the name of Belg ſeems to have been highly characteriſtic of their greatneſs, as Balc in Iriſh ſignifies Strong or Mighty. This Etymon at leaſt does not, like Mr. Macpherſon's, violate any proprieties of criticiſm. It confronts no evidence of records. And it is not made either the buttreſs or the baſis of any viſionary ſyſtem in hiſtory.

P. 32, 33. "The Celto-Germanic tribes, who "had driven the old Gael from Belgium, ſettling "in that diviſion of Gaul, roſe, in proceſs of "time, into a variety of petty ſtates. Each of "theſe, ſome time before the arrival of Cæſar, "ſent colonies into Britain.—It is difficult to "aſcertain the æra of this third migration from "the continent."

The Belgæ are aſſerted by Mr. Macpherſon to have made two migrations into Britain, and to have ſettled two colonies in the iſland, one

[1] Cæſar p. 34. [2] Cæſar p. 1.

under

under the name of Cimbri, and the other under the appellation of Belgæ. The exiſtence of the former incident I have already demonſtrated to be merely viſionary. But the latter is real. Mr. Macpherſon however, in dividing one migration and one colony into two, has even thrown an air of fiction and falſity over the truth.

As the Belgæ were broken into various tribes when they croſſed the Rhine, they muſt already have formed a variety of petty ſtates. And this is confirmed by Cæſar's account of them. When he enquired of the Rhemi concerning their neighbours the Belgæ, quæ civitates, quantæque in armis eſſent, et quid in bello poſſent, ſic reperiebat, pleroſque Belgas eſſe ortos a Germanis, that moſt of their civitates or tribes were derived from Germany, the Bellovaci, the Sueſſiones, the Nervii, and the Attrebates, the Ambiani, the Morini, the Menapii, and the Caletes, the Velocaſſes, the Veromandui, and the Atuatici; and that the other ſtates were native Germans, Condruſos, Eburones, Cæraeſos, Pæmanos, qui uno nomine Germani appellantur [1]. There was no need therefore of any interval of time after the invaſion of Gaul by the Belgæ, to reduce them into various ſtates. Already reduced, they therefore ranged as diſtinct tribes in Germany, and therefore ſettled as diſtinct

[1] P. 33 and 34.

communities

communities in Gaul. Nor did each of theſe ſtates ſend colonies into Britain. The number of Belgic communities in Gaul was 12. And the number of Belgic colonies in Britain was only 5. Theſe were the Cantii of Kent, the Regni of Suſſex, the Proper Belgæ of Hampſhire and Wiltſhire, the Durotriges of Dorſetſhire, and the Damnonii of Devonſhire. And theſe afterwards planted a new colony, under the name of Trinovantes, in the counties of Middleſex and Eſſex.

P. 33. "It is difficult to aſcertain the æra of "this third migration from the continent. We "ought to place it perhaps half a century prior "to the arrival of Cæſar. Divitiacus, King of "the Sueſſiones, who flouriſhed before that "great commander, may probably have tranſ-"planted from Gaul thoſe tribes in Britain over "whom he reigned."

When the Belgæ made their imaginary migration into Britain, under the name of Cimbri, about three centuries before Chriſt, they are ſuppoſed to have paſſed over into the iſland immediately after their arrival in Gaul. "Deſ-"crying, from their new ſettlements, the iſland "of Britain, they paſſed the narrow channel "which divides it from the continent [1]." Their

[1] P. 30.

ſecond

ſecond migration into Britain, under the name of Belgæ, is puſhed two centuries lower, in order to make it diſtinct and ſeparate from the other. But as they only made one of theſe expeditions into the iſland, ſo this was begun as early as 3½ centuries before Chriſt. That invaluable collector of antient notices, Richard of Cirenceſter, here throws a remarkable light upon the dark period of the Britiſh hiſtory. A. M. 3650. Has terras intrârunt Belgæ—and, Ejecti a Belgis Britones [1]. And the Belgæ were certainly not tranſplanted by Divitiacus into Britain. They had been ſettled about 250 years in the iſland, when Divitiacus came over into it. Apud Sueſſiones, ſays Cæſar, fuiſſe regem noſtrâ etiam memoriâ Divitiacum, totius Galliæ potentiſſimum, qui, quum magnæ partis harum regionum, tum etiam Britanniæ, imperium obtinuerit [2]. He acquired the ſovereignty of the continental and the iſland Belgæ. And, bringing over a large reinforcement of the former, he enabled the latter to extend their poſſeſſions into the interiour regions of the country. Cum exercitu in hoc regnum tranſiit Rex Æduorum [Sueſſionum] Divitiacus, magnamque ejus partem ſubegit [3]. The poſſeſſions of the Belgæ, before the coming of Divitiacus, in all probability ex-

[1] P. 50. [2] P. 34. [3] P. 50.

tended

tended, as I have ſhewn already in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter, over Kent and a ſmall part of Middleſex, over Suſſex, and the greateſt part of Hampſhire and Wiltſhire, over Dorſetſhire, Devonſhire, and a part of Cornwall. And he ſubdued the reſt of Middleſex, and all Eſſex, all Surrey, the reſt of Hampſhire, and the adjoining parts of Berkſhire, the reſt of Wiltſhire, the remainder of Cornwall, all Somerſetſhire, and the South-Weſt of Glouceſterſhire [1].—The æra of the Belgic migration into Britain then is here aſcertained, and ſhewn to have been, not "half "a century," but three centuries, "prior to the "arrival of Cæſar." And Divitiacus is ſhewn not to "have tranſplanted from Gaul thoſe tribes in "Britain over whom he reigned," but only to have brought over an army, and to have only made ſome additions to the previous poſſeſſions of the Belgæ.

THIS is the ſhort ſum of Mr. Macpherſon's arguments for a third colony in Britain. As the proof of a colony of Belgæ in the iſland, the ar-

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 60, 61, and 412, 413.

gument carries every conviction with it. But as the proof of a third colony, as a proof that the Belgæ firſt ſettled in Britain under their own name about a century only before Chriſt, it is equally erroneous and trifling.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

THUS far I have attended minutely to the motions of Mr. Macpherſon's Celtæ on the continent. I have demonſtrated his account of them, I think, to be one groſs perverſion of the real hiſtory. And I ſhall now follow him into the iſland. By diſproving the incidents and reaſonings, from which he deduces the origin of three colonies in Britain, I have diſproved the exiſtence of them already. But I ſhall ſtill purſue him through all his reaſonings and facts in the iſland, and endeavour to unravel the one and to overthrow the other, with the ſame reſpect to Mr. Macpherſon, and with the ſame fidelity to truth.

I.

CONCERNING THE POSITION, MANNERS, AND TRANSACTIONS OF MR. MACPHERSON'S THREE COLONIES IN BRITAIN.

PAG. 32. "When the Romans carried their "arms into Britain, the whole iſland was "poſſeſſed by three nations ſprung originally, "though at very different periods, from the Gael "of the continent."

Let us examine this poſition by the account of him, who was the firſt Roman that carried his arms into Britain, and who is the moſt accurate diſtinguiſher of the general diviſions of the Britons. Britanniæ pars interior, he ſays, ab iis incolitur, quos natos in inſulâ ipsâ *memoriâ proditum* dicunt: maritima pars ab iis qui — ex Belgis tranſierant[1]. Here we ſee the iſland, not partitioned, like Gaul, into three diviſions, but

[1] Cæſar, p. 82.

broken

broken only into two. Here we ſee the iſlanders, not divided, as Mr. Macpherſon has divided them, into Gael, Cimbri, and Belgæ; but diſtinguiſhed merely into Belgæ and Aborigines. The Belgæ were known to have paſſed lately and recently from the continent, in compariſon with the Aborigines, though they came 300 years before Cæſar. And the Aborigines had been all of them many ages before, all of them immemorially, ſettled in the iſland. The aſſertion of Mr. Macpherſon, therefore, is directly in the face of hiſtory. And, when the Romans carried their arms into Britain, the whole country was poſſeſſed only by two great diviſions of people.

— "The Cimbri, — retiring from the preſ-
"ſure of theſe new invaders [the Belgæ], poſ-
"ſeſſed the country to the Weſt of the Severne,
"and that which extended from the Humber to
"the Tweed. The Gael, under the general
"name of Caledonians, inhabited the reſt of the
"iſland to the extremity of the North."

The whole ſouthern region of the iſland, from the Britiſh Channel to the Humber and from the Severne to the German ocean, is here conſigned over to the Belgæ. And this is done, equally without any pretence of authority, and in direct oppoſition to proof. Any perſon, that has the leaſt acquaintance with the interior diſpoſition of the iſland in the time of the Britons, muſt know

this to be utterly falſe. Cæſar, as I have quoted him immediately above, expreſsly aſſerts the Belgæ to have been confined to the ſouthern coaſt. Britanniæ *pars interior* ab iis quos natos in inſulâ ipsâ memoriâ proditum dicunt: *Maritima pars ab iis qui — ex Belgis tranſierant.* And ſo far were the Belgæ from advancing their poſſeſſions up to the Humber, that they actually carried them very little beyond the Thames[1]. Thus unhappy is Mr. Macpherſon in every ſtep that he takes, on his entrance upon the Interior Hiſtory of Britain.

P. 33, 34. "This ſuperior civilization [of "the Belgæ] rendered them objects of depreda- "tion to the Cimbri —. They made frequent in- "curſions into the Belgic dominions; and it was "from that circumſtance that the Cimbri be- "yond the Humber derived their name of Bri- "gantes, which ſignifies a race of freebooters "and plunderers (On lui donna ce nom à cauſe "des pillages qu'il faiſoit ſur les terres de ſes "voiſins. BRIGAND ou BRIGANT, Brigand, "Pillard, Voleur de Grand-Chemin. Bullet "Memoires ſur la lang. Celt. tom. i.)." [2]

[1] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 412, 413.

[2] So in Dr. Macpherſon the Brigantes are interpreted Robbers, p. 112.

The

The only reaſon, for Mr. Macpherſon's fixing the Cimbri between the Humber and the Tweed, as well as in Wales, was obviouſly the antient and preſent appellation of Cumberland in one part of it. And the only ground, for Mr. Macpherſon's aſſerting the incurſions of the Cimbri into the dominions of the Belgæ, was the appellation of Brigantes in another. Upon ſuch ſlight ſprings does the vaſt machine of this hiſtory move. But, as the Belgæ never extended their poſſeſſions to the Humber, the Cimbri beyond it could not poſſibly make incurſions into them. And, even if they could, as thoſe invaſions were made equally by their brethren of Wales as by them, their brethren muſt equally with them have obtained the opprobrious appellation of Brigantes.

But the Brigantes were not denominated at all from any incurſions to the South of the Humber. They made none that appear in hiſtory. Able as we are to diſcover their expeditions into Lancaſhire, Weſtmoreland, Cumberland, Anandale, and Cheſhire [1], we have not one trace of any into the counties of Lincoln and Nottingham. And the name was not peculiar to the Britons of Yorkſhire and Durham. It was equally the name of ſome of the Celtic ſettlers on the Alps [2], of

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 8, and 104, 105.

[2] Strabo, p. 316. Amſtel. and ſee p. 190 alſo.

ſome of Mr. Macpherſon's Belgæ to the South of the Humber, and of all Mr. Macpherſon's Gael to the North of the Tweed. Galgacus, a native Briton, calls the Iceni, the Trinovantes, and the Caſſii, all that united in the great revolt under Boadicea, by the general name of Brigantes: Brigantes, feminâ duce, exurere coloniam, expugnare caſtra, &c. [1]. And Pauſanias, ſpeaking of the whole body of the Caledonians, equally calls them all Brigantes [2].

This name then could not poſſibly be given to the Britons of Yorkſhire, becauſe of their frequent incurſions to the South of the Humber. They made none. And the name was given equally to others, and even to Mr. Macpherſon's own plundered Belgæ. It was in truth the general appellation of the Aboriginal tribes of Britain. The name of Cymri was brought with the firſt coloniſts into the iſland, the hereditary appellation of their anceſtors on the continent. But the name of Brigantes was conferred upon them in conſequence of their paſſage into it, and was the natural ſignature of their ſeparation from their brethren in Gaul [3]. And it was therefore the equal appellation of thoſe Celtæ, who had migrated from the reſt by croſſing the channel

[1] Agric. Vit. c. 31.

[2] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 9, 10. and 454.

[3] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 9, 10.

into

into Britain, and of thoſe who had ſequeſtered themſelves from the reſt among the mountains and vallies of the Alps.—Nor was the name of Brigantes confined merely to the Aboriginal tribes of the iſland. It was extended equally to the communities of the Belgæ within it. The Belgic Trinovantes are included by Galgacus, together with the Iceni and the Caſſii, under the general deſignation of Brigantes. And all the tribes of the Belgæ in Britain were therefore expreſsly denominated, as a nation on the continent, that was incloſed on three ſides from the reſt of the Gauls by the Soane and the Rhone, equally was, the Allo-Brog-es, or the ſequeſtered and ſeparated Gauls[1].

It is an obvious truth, but it has been little attended to by the tribe of etymologiſts from Bochart to Mr. Macpherſon, that names deſcriptive of national manners cannot poſſibly be the original appellations of any people. They reſult from the intercourſe and experience of the ſtates around them, and are the natural expreſſions of their paſſions and feelings. And they muſt therefore in their own nature, not be primary, but poſterior, denominations; not the names under which the nations originally ſettled in their own poſſeſſions, but thoſe which were

[1] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 9, and Cæſar, p. 4 and 6.

impoſed

impoſed upon them afterwards, when they encroached upon the poſſeſſions of others. Hence the name of Brigantes came to ſignify, on the continent and in the iſland, a turbulent plundering race of men [1]. Hence the name of Cimbri acquired the ſame ſignification in Germany [2]. And thus the names of the Celtic Ambrones and Gael finally ſunk into mere words of reproach, and came to import, even among the Celtæ and the Gael of this iſland, the Ferocious and the Stranger.

P. 32. "The Cimbri — poſſeſſed the country "to the Weſt of the Severne, and that which "extended from the Humber to the Tweed. "The Gael, under the general name of Cale"donians, inhabited the reſt of the iſland to the "extremity of the North."

I have already demonſtrated this diviſion of the iſland to be directly contrary to hiſtory, as it reſpects the Belgæ. I ſhall now endeavour to prove it equally wrong, as it reſpects the Cimbri and the Gael.

[1] See Strabo, p. 316; and Camden, p. 556. Edit. 1607.

[2] Plutarch, p. 495. vol. ii.

[3] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 429, for Ambrones: and the Iriſh call a ſtranger and an enemy Gael at preſent.

The

The names of Gael and Cimbri were not appropriated, as our author has apppropriated them from the beginning. Gael was not the diſtinguiſhing appellation of the Caledonians from the Cimbri and the Belgæ. And Cimbri was not the diſtinguiſhing appellation of the Welſh and the Brigantes from the Belgæ and the Gael. Mr. Macpherſon's Belgæ were denominated Cimbri, and Mr. Macpherſon's Belgæ and Cimbri were denominated Gael.

I have previouſly ſhewn the name of Cymri to have been the great hereditary diſtinction of the Gauls upon the continent, and to have been carried with them into all their conqueſts. There I have ſhewn it to have been retained, equally as the general title of all their tribes, and as the particular deſignation of ſome. And it was not retained in our own iſland, as Mr. Macpherſon ſuppoſes, merely by the natives of Wales and the Britons of Brigantia. It was equally the name of a nation in the South-Weſt of Somerſetſhire and the North-Eaſt of Cornwall. In hoc brachio, quæ [quod] intermiſſione Uxellæ amnis Heduorum regioni protenditur, ſita eſt regio Cimbrorum [1]. And the name appears plainly, not to have been continued as a particular appellation from the beginning, but to have been taken up at different periods by different tribes, even in ſuperſedence of their

[1] Richard p. 20. and Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 61.

own

own previous appellations, when they wanted to diſtinguiſh themſelves from their enemies around them. Thus the Cimbri of Somerſetſhire and Cornwall were poſſeſt of the appellation before the Romans arrived in the iſland, becauſe they were cloſely ſkirted by their enemies, the Belgæ of Cornwall, Devonſhire, Dorſetſhire, and Somerſetſhire [1]. The Voluntii of Brigantia in the 6th century, when they were preſſed by the Saxons from the Eaſt, laid aſide the appellation by which they had been diſtinguiſhed for ages, and, as the Welſh Cymri is colloquially pronounced Cumri, denominated themſelves Cumbri [2]; and the principal part of their country is called Cumberland at preſent. And the Silures, the Dimetæ, and the Ordovices, of Wales, in the later ages of their Empire, when they were attacked by the Saxons on every ſide, threw off their former appellations entirely, and have ever ſince diſtinguiſhed themſelves by the generical appellation of Cymri.

The names of Cymri and of Gael are both equally the general deſignations of the Celtæ. The former related only to the Patriarch of the

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 61, and 413.

[2] Hence Llomarch Hean, a nobleman of Voluntia, and a writer of the 6th century, flying with many others from the Saxons of the North into Shropſhire, calls it the paradiſe of the Cumbrians, Pouys Paraduys Gumri (Lhuyds Archæologia, under Llowarch).

Line;

Line; but the latter, as I ſhall ſhew hereafter, to the reſidence of his poſterity among the wilds and woodlands of Gaul. Denominated Gael upon the continent, the coloniſts continued the name in the iſland. And it ſurvives not, as Mr. Macpherſon uniformly imagines, ſolely in that name of Gael which the Iriſh and Highlanders reciprocally give themſelves. It ſurvives, as I have ſhewed before, in the name of Gathel, which is equally pronounced Gael, and was once equally the appellation of the Iriſh, the Highlanders, and the Welſh. And it ſurvives alſo in the name of Welſh, the whole body of the Provincials being repeatedly denominated in general Bryt-Walas, Wilſc, or Welſh, in the Saxon Chronicle; the Britons of Kent, the Britons of Suſſex, the Britons of Hampſhire, the Britons of Dorſetſhire, the Britons of Wiltſhire, the Britons of Bedfordſhire, the Britons of Somerſetſhire, the Britons of Cheſhire, and the Britons of Clydiſdale in Scotland, being all diſtinctly particularized in the Chronicle as Wealas, Walen, or Bryt-Wealas; and the Britons of Galloway, Wales, and Cornwall retaining the appellation at preſent [1]. Theſe are ſuch obvious

[1] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 437.—In p. 1. of the Sax. Chron. the Britons are called Britiſh or Wilſh, in p. 2. the Britons that oppoſed Cæſar's paſſage over the Thames are called Brytwalas, in p. 7. all the Provincials to the South of Severus's Wall are named Brytwalum, and in p. 11 and 12.

relicks

relicks of the name of Gael, ſcattered over the whole face of the iſland, that it is very ſurprizing Mr. Macpherſon ſhould ever have thought of appropriating the name to the Iriſh and the Highlanders.

The Welſh then, who from their name of Cymri are inferred by Mr. Macpherſon to be a diſtinct colony from the Gael, may with greater reaſon be inferred from their names of Gathel and of Welſh, to be abſolutely the ſame with them. And the name of Wales, which has been univerſally affirmed by the Engliſh criticks to have been impoſed upon the country by the Saxons, and as univerſally agreed by the Welſh to have been never acknowledged by their countrymen, actually appears the acknowledged appellation of the region as early as the 6th century, and in the poems of a Welſh Bard;

Eu Ner a folant,
Eu hiaith a gadwant,
Eu tir a gollant,
Ond gwyllt Wallia [1];

actually all the Provincials, all from the Friths to the Britiſh Channel, are denominated Brytwalas and Brytwalana. The Welſh of Kent are repeatedly mentioned in p. 14, of Suſſex twice in p. 14, of Hampſhire p. 15, of Dorſetſhire p. 25. (See Carte, p. 226. V. I.), of Wiltſhire p. 20, of Bedfordſhire p. 22, of Somerſetſhire p. 39, of Cheſhire p. 25, and of Clydiſdale p. 83 and 110.

[1] Talieſſin, as cited by Mr. Wynne in Gent. Mag. for July

They

They ſhall ſtill praiſe their Maker,
They ſhall ſtill keep their language,
They ſhall ſtill be deprived of their lands,
Except uncultivated Wales.

The Belgæ, who are ſuppoſed to be ſtill more diſtinct, and were actually very different, from the Gael, yet, being equally derived with them from Gaul, bear equally the appellation of Gael; the Belgæ being all denominated in general, like a tribe on the continent of Gaul, Allo-Broges, or the Galli Brigantes, amongſt the antients; and the Belgæ of Kent, Suſſex, Hampſhire, Dorſetſhire, Wiltſhire, and Somerſetſhire, being all ſpecifically denominated Wealas in the Saxon Chronicle. The Cymri and the Belgæ are both denominated Gael, with the Iriſh and the Highlanders. And Mr. Macpherſon's Belgæ I have ſhewn before to have been alſo denominated Cimbri, with the Welſh. The name therefore, which Mr. Macpherſon ſelects as the diſtinguiſhing mark of his 2d colony from his 1ſt and 3d, appears to have been common to his 3d and 2d. And the name, which Mr. Macpherſon aſſigns as the ſure ſignature of his 1ſt, appears to have been familiar to all the three.

1770, and alſo in a Pamphlet on the Welſh language printed a few years ago at Cowbridge in Glamorganſhire.

P. 35, 36.—" The three great Britiſh Nations, " whoſe origin we have endeavoured to in- " veſtigate, muſt have differed conſiderably from " one another in language, manners, and cha- " racter. Though deſcended from the ſame " ſource, their ſeparation into different channels " was very remote. The Gael—, having paſſed " from the continent before the arts of civil " life had made any conſiderable progreſs among " them, retained the pure but unimproved lan- " guage of their anceſtors together with their " rude ſimplicity of manners. The Britiſh " Cimbri derived their origin from the Galic " colonies who, in remote antiquity, had ſettled " beyond the Rhine. Theſe, with a ſmall mix- " ture of the Sarmatæ, returned, in all their " original barbariſm, into the regions of the " South. During their ſeparation from their " mother nation, their language and manners " muſt have ſuffered ſuch a conſiderable change, " that it is extremely doubtful whether their " dialect of the Celtic and that of the old Britiſh " Gael were, at the arrival of the former in " this iſland, reciprocally underſtood by both " nations. The third colony differed in every " thing from the Gael and Cimbri. Their " manners were more humanized; and their " tongue, though perhaps corrupted, was more " copious. They had left the continent at a " period of advanced civility.—But—the ra-

" dical

" dical words uſed by all were certainly the " ſame."

Are the ſeveral parts of this Extract compleatly at unity with themſelves? They ſeem to be a little heterogeneous. We are firſt told, that the three nations muſt have differed conſiderably in their language, and that it is extremely doubtful, whether the Cimbric and the Gaelic were reciprocally underſtood at firſt: and yet we are afterwards told, that " the radical " words uſed by all were certainly the ſame." The Gael and Cimbri are ſaid to have " differed " conſiderably in their manners," when they both retained " the rude ſimplicity of their " anceſtors," and " their original barbariſm of " manners," " with a ſmall mixture of the Sar- " matæ" adhering to one of them. The Cimbri are ſaid to have returned " in all their original " barbariſm" into Gaul; though, " during " their ſeparation from it, their manners muſt " have ſuffered a conſiderable change." They returned only " with a ſmall mixture of the Sar- " matæ" in their manners; and yet the change was " conſiderable."—And are not the ſeveral parts of this Extract in a ſtate of hoſtility with other paſſages in the work? The Gael are here repreſented, as coming over from Gaul " before " the arts of civil life had made any conſider- " able progreſs," and as therefore retaining " the rude ſimplicity of their anceſtors:" and

yet the Cimbri, who came over from Gaul ſome ages afterward, are repreſented as arriving here "in a rude barbarity [1]," and "in all their ori-"ginal barbariſm." The Gael are brought into Britain, before the arts had made any *conſiderable* progreſs in Gaul, and conſequently after they had made *ſome*; as alſo in p. 34 the Gauls appear to have arrived at "ſome degree of "civilization," before the Gael left them: and yet the Cimbri, who left the continent three ages afterwards, when the arts of civil life muſt have been conſiderably advanced, bring with them a rude barbarity of manners. The Cimbri are here wafted into the iſland in all their original barbariſm: and yet, before the Cimbri came over, we find that "the domeſtic improve-"ments" in Gaul "had arrived at ſome degree "of maturity [2]." In p. 24 the Gauls appear to have arrived at "ſome degree of civilization," and in p. 8 agriculture in particular appears to have been "proſecuted with vigour and ſucceſs," before the Gael left the country: and yet the Gael are here ſaid to have retained the rude ſimplicity of their anceſtors; and in p. 47 the Gael, and in p. 33 even the more ſoutherly Cimbri, are both repreſented as totally ignorant of agriculture.—But let us not ſcrutinize too nicely.

I have repeatedly ſhewn the exiſtence of theſe 3 colonies, in the iſland, to be all the creation of

[1] P. 33. [2] P. 10.

Mr.

Mr. Macpherſon's prejudices. And that Mr. Macpherſon's Gael, Cimbri, and Belgæ differed very little from each other in their language and manners, is very evident. The language of all the three was exactly the ſame; as is plain to a demonſtration from the appearance of the ſame names of towns, of rivers, and of tribes among all. We have Camulodunum for the name of a fortreſs among Mr. Macpherſon's Cimbri of Yorkſhire, and his Belgæ of Eſſex; Lindum amongſt his Belgæ and his Gael; and Venta for the Capital of his Cimbri in Wales, and of his Belgæ in Hampſhire and in Norfolk; Urus or Ure, the name of a river in Yorkſhire and in Suffolk, and an appellative for a river in the Erſe at preſent[1]; and Alauna, Deva, and Devana, all three, rivers in the country equally of his Gael, his Belgæ, and his Cimbri; Novantes, a tribe of his Belgæ and his Gael; the Damnonii[2] and Cantæ among his Gael, and the Cantii and Damnonii among his Belgæ; and one tribe of his Gael, and two of his Belgæ, equally denominated Carnabii. And the manners of the three were but little different.

Mr. Macpherſon himſelf ſhall convince us, that there was no great difference. The moſt humanized of any of the iſlanders, the Belgæ, are

[1] See Mr. Macpherſon, p. 34. a note.

[2] The Damnii of Valentia are called both Damnii and Damnonii by Ptolemy.

expreſsly mentioned by Mr. Macpherſon, in p. 33, to have arrived to this "pitch of cultiva-"tion," that "they ſowed corn, they had fixed "abodes, and ſome degree of commerce was "carried on in their ports." And, as ſome of the other Britons equally ſowed corn, ſo all of them had fixed abodes. Interiores plerique, ſays Cæſar, frumenta non ſerunt: ſome of them therefore did. Cæſar alſo found towns, and exactly the ſame ſort of towns, among the Aboriginal and the Belgic Britons [z]. And the only difference between the Belgæ and all the other iſlanders was this, according to Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, that the former carried on *ſome* commerce from their ports.

Nor was the difference great in itſelf betwixt the real Britons and the real Belgæ. They both conſtructed their houſes in the ſame manner, uſed the ſame ſtated pieces of braſs or iron bullion for money, had the ſame fondneſs for keeping poultry and hares about their houſes, and the ſame averſion to ſeeing them upon their tables. They both painted their bodies, both threw off their cloaths in the hour of battle, both ſuffered the hair of their head to grow to a great length, both ſhaved all but the upper lip, both had wives in common, and both proſecuted their wars on the ſame principles. In all

[z] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 467.

theſe

theſe particulars, the great and principal ſtrokes in the national character, the Belgæ and the Britons univerſally agreed. Several of the Britons likewiſe concurred with the Belgæ in their attention to agriculture, and in wearing garments of woolen. And the only diſtinction betwixt them was one, which was really no difference of manners at all; that the Britons, being diſlodged from all that ſide of the iſland which was immediately contiguous to Gaul and Spain, and the only part of it which was viſited by the foreign traders, were no longer able to purſue the commerce which they had previouſly carried on, and were obliged to reſign it up to the Belgæ [1].

P. 34—37. "SILURES —, Siol, a race of "men, Urus, the river emphatically, in alluſion "to their ſituation beyond the Severne.— "CANTIUM, Kent, Canti, end of the Iſland. "TRINOBANTES, Trion-oban, marſhy diſtrict; "the inhabitants of Middleſex and Eſſex.— "DOBUNI, Dobh-buini, living on the bank of "the river; they who of old poſſeſſed the coun- "ty of Glouceſter, alluding to their ſituation on "the banks of the Severne. — ORDOVICES,

[1] See Cæſar, p. 88, 89, and Hiſt. of Mancheſter, p. 385.

" Ord-tuavich, northern mountaineers, the in-
" habitants of North Wales."

Before I perufed Mr. Macpherfon's Differtation, I was full of expectation, to fee the taſk of Britiſh etymology wreſted out of the clumſy hands, in which a general ignorance of the Celtic had hitherto placed it. But ſanguine expectations are ſeldom gratified. And perhaps I expected more than knowledge could ſupply. Mr. Macpherſon however appears plainly, I think, to have derived all his knowledge of the Celtic from the view merely of one of its dialects. And he is frequently unhappy, I apprehend, in his application of that. This I have already ſhewn in the names of Celt, Cimbri, and Brigantes. And I hope to ſhew it again in the names before us.

Cantium, here reſolved into Cant-i, the end of the iſland, muſt be formed upon the ſame principle, as the appellation of the Cantæ in Caledonia, who reſided not at the end of the iſland, but lived along the eaſtern coaſt of it, and to the South of the Frith of Dornoch [1]; and as the preſent name of Cantire in Scotland, which is ſtill farther from the end of the iſland, and lies along the weſtern coaſt. And the word is clearly Cand or Cant, an Head or Prominence of land,

[1] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 411.

and

and actually appears in Ptolemy's names for the South-Foreland, Cantion or A-Cantion, Promontory or The Promontory [1]. The Cantii and Cantæ equally borrowed their appellation, from their position upon the headlands of their coast. And Cantire literally signifies an Headland.

The division of Trinobantes into Trion-oban must appear very surprizing, when we consider, that the tribe is denominated Novanei or Novantes in the coins of Cunobeline. And the interpretation of it into Marshy District must appear equally wonderful, when we reflect, that it was originally the name of the dry gravelly site of London. The Belgæ of Kent pushed across the Thames, and seized the South of Middlesex, under the title of Novantes or New-comers [2]. This must have happened a considerable period before the descent of Cæsar, as they then formed a powerful kingdom to the North of the Thames [3], and must therefore have then held all the territories that they afterwards possessed in Middlesex and Essex. Upon their irruption into the South of Middlesex, they selected the fine site of the present London, the eminence betwixt the Thames and the Fleetbrook, for the area of

[1] See History of Manchester, p. 467.

[2] History of Manchester, p. 60, 62, and 412.

[3] Trinobantes, prope firmissima earum regionum civitas, p. 92.

a fortreſs; and the town, that was deſtined to be afterwards the imperial ſeat of Britain, they called by the local title of Lon-din or the Water-town, and by the national appellation of Tre-Novantum or the fortreſs of the Novantes [1]. And, as they ſpread afterwards from London over all Middleſex and Eſſex, they carried the name of their original town with them, and their appellation of Novantes was lengthened into Trinovantes.

Dobuni, formed of Dobh-buini, and interpreted the reſidents on a river, means undoubtedly, as it has been always rendered, the men of the valley. They are therefore called Dubni and Duni in the varying denomination of Cogi-Dubnus and Cogi-Dunus [2], Dumni in the appellation of Togi-Dumnus, and actually and expreſsly Boduni in Dio. All theſe terms equally ſignify the Lowlanders. And the concurrence of all in one meaning deciſively fixes it.—And Ordovices, here analyſed into Ord-tuavich, and tranſlated Northern Mountaineers, I have ſhewn, I think, to be Ordo-Uices or Ordo-Vices, the Honourable Vices or the Great Huiccii [3]; as in the fifth century we have a Britiſh hero popularly de-

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 412 and 413.
[2] Chicheſter Inſcription, and Tacitus.
[3] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 148.

pominated

nominated Eneon Urd, the ſame word with Ard, only varied by the pronunciation, and ſignifying Eneon the Honourable or Great[1]; and as we have a promontory in Scotland, bearing the equal appellation of Urd and Ord Head at preſent.

The etymon of Silures is evidently deduced from too trifling and remote a circumſtance, their bordering upon the Severn in one part, or, as Mr. Macpherſon expreſſes himſelf, their reſiding beyond it. And the true etymon may perhaps be, S, Il or Ile, Ur, The Great Men. So we have Elgovæ and Selgovæ in Ptolemy, as the name of the ſame people. And the Silures had a juſt claim to this magnificent appellation, being a very powerful tribe, and having ſubdued the Ordovices and Dimetæ of Wales. They appear alſo pretty plainly, though they have never been ſuſpected, to have once poſſeſſed the Caſſiterides. The principal of theſe iſlands is denominated Silura inſula by Solinus, as all of them are to this day denominated the Silley Iſles. Richard has applied to the Silures, what Solinus has ſpoken of the inhabitants of Silura[2]. And Tacitus evidently carries the poſſeſſions of the Silures to the Caſſiterides, by placing them oppoſite to Spain: Silurum colorati vultus, & torti plerumque crines, & *poſitu contra Hiſpaniam*, &c.[3].

[1] See Carte, vol. i. p. 179. [2] P. 21.
[3] Agric. vit. c. 11.

P. 38.

P. 38. "Alba or Albin, the name of [by] "which the antient Scots, in their native lan- "guage, have, from all antiquity, diſtinguiſhed "their own diviſion of Britain, ſeems to be the "fountain from which the Greeks deduced their "Albion. It was natural for the Gael, who "tranſmigrated from the low plains of Belgium, "to call the more elevated land of Britain by a "name expreſſive of the face of the country. "Alb or Alp, in the Celtic, ſignifies High, and "In, invariably, a country."

That the Gael tranſmigrated from the low plains of Belgium, is a mere aſſertion without authority; as the uſe of the word Belgium here is abſolutely equivocal. According to Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, they came not from Belgium, modernly ſo called, or Holland, but from the "Belgic diviſion of Gaul [1]," which reached from the Seine and the Marne to the mouth of the Rhine [2]. And they came undoubtedly from that part of the diviſion, which is the neareſt to Britain, and from which they could deſcry the iſland. Mr. Macpherſon accordingly repreſents the migration of the Gael, to have been "in croſſing a "*very narrow* channel into Britain [3]." The fact therefore, of the Gael paſſing over into Britain from the low plains of Belgium, being un-

[1] P. 26. [2] Cæſar, p. 1. [3] P. 26.

grounded

grounded in hiſtory and contradictory to reaſon, the etymology which is founded upon it muſt neceſſarily fall with it.—Nor is the etymology juſt in itſelf. Inis or In is ſo far from ſignifying invariably a country in general, that, I believe, it invariably ſignifies an iſland only. In its general acceptation it certainly means only an iſland. And the etymology of a popular name, which ſtands in direct oppoſition to the popular import of the word, muſt for that very reaſon be wrong [1].

What then is the derivation of the name of Albion? It is the ſame, I think, that has been already given in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter [2]. — Not impoſed by the mere anceſtors of the Caledonians, as is here inſinuated; it was never impoſed, aſſuredly, by any of the reſidents in the country. As the iſland regularly roſe every morning to the eye of the Gauls that inhabited along the coaſt of Calais, and as its chalky cliffs glittered continually in the ſun, the Gauls muſt certainly have beheld them, and could not but have given them ſome appropriate appellation. This, it is obvious, muſt neceſſarily have been

[1] So in Dr. Macpherſon, p. 116, 117, we have the ſame interpretation of Albion, the ſame fallacy concerning Belgium, and the ſame derivation of the firſt Britons from "the low "plains of Belgium."

[2] P. 9.

the

the caſe. This we muſt ſuppoſe to have happened, if no name had been tranſmitted to us that was characteriſtic of the circumſtance. And the coincidence of the reaſon and the name is a deciſive evidence of the fact. As the Gauls beheld the heights appearing on the other ſide of the water, they naturally diſtinguiſhed them by a name, that was expreſſive only of the ſenſible appearance which they formed to the eye, and called them Alb-ion or Heights. Alb in the ſingular lengthens into Alb-an, Alb-on, Alb-ain, or Alb-ion in the plural. And we have the ſame word in the Gallic appellation of the mountains that divide Italy from Gaul. The Alps, ſome ages before the days of Strabo, were called Albia; and a very high mountain, that terminated the Alps upon one ſide, was denominated Albius in his time [1]. And, equally ſome ages before, the Alps were denominated Albia and Alpionia; and in his time there remained two tribes on the mountains, that bore the names of Albiœci and Albienſes [2]. The name therefore was the natural Celtic term for heights or eminences. As ſuch, it was applied to the

[1] P. 309 and 483, Strabo.

[2] Strabo, p. 309 and 311.—Theſe mountains were not inhabited when Belloveſus croſſed them into Italy (Livy, l. v. c. 34): and they were afterwards poſſeſſed by many bodies of the Gauls (Strabo, p. 190.).

cliffs

cliffs of Britain and the mountains of Gaul. And, as ſuch, it is retained by the preſent Highlanders for their own, very mountainous, diviſion of Britain. The firſt name of the iſland, then, was given it before the country was inhabited. Had it been given after that period, and from a view "of the face of the country;" derived as the firſt inhabitants undoubtedly were, acroſs the narroweſt part of the channel, from the bold ſhore of Calais, and ſo very level, in general, as all the ſouthern part of the iſland undoubtedly is, they could never have diſtinguiſhed it by the name of Albion. But accuſtomed to ſee it daily from their own ſhores, and accuſtomed to call it the Heights, they ſoon paſſed over in all probability from mere motives of curioſity, they perhaps ſtocked ſome of the nearer woods with wild beaſts for their hunting, and ages afterwards formed a regular ſettlement on the Albion, that they had ſo long ſeen, denominated, and viſited [1].

P. 39. "The Cimbri — arriving in Belgium, "and deſcrying Albion, gave it a new name ex-"preſſive of the ſame idea which firſt ſuggeſted

[1] The Romans therefore frequently deſcribe Albion as a level country. Mela ſays, Siciliæ maxime ſimilis, *Plana*, ingens, &c. (l. iii. c. 6.). And Strabo ſays, εστι δ' η πλειστη της νησου ΠΕΔΙΑΣ (p. 305).

"the

" the appellation of Albion to the Gael. Com-
" paring the elevated coaſt of Britain to the fenny
" plains of the Lower Germany, they called it
" BRAIT-AN, a word compounded of Brait High
" and An or In a Country [1]."

The author has again impoſed upon himſelf by the uſe of the equivocal term, Belgium. And he has even applied it here in a double acceptation. As relating to " the fenny plains of the " Lower Germany," it can mean only Holland. But as the place from which the Cimbri could " deſcry Albion," and mark " the elevated coaſt " of Britain," it refers only to Belgic Gaul. Britain may be ſeen from the cliffs of the latter, but cannot be diſcerned from the low plains of the former. — Nor is the author quite conſiſtent with himſelf in this and the preceding account. The name of Britain, we are told, was " ex-
" preſſive of the ſame idea which firſt ſuggeſted
" the appellation of Albion to the Gael." And yet Albion is ſaid to be " a name expreſſive of " the *face* of the country," and Britain to be derived from a view of its " elevated *coaſt*."—But, even if theſe accounts were conſiſtent, it ſhews ſurely a great want of attention, to deduce the name of Albion from the appearance of the country to thoſe who had migrated into it, and the name of Britain from the aſpect of the coaſt to

[1] So Dr. Macpherſon, p. 333, interprets Britain to ſignify Hills.

the

the diſtant inhabitants of Gaul. This refers the ſecond name to the view of the coaſt, which ſhould naturally have given birth to the firſt; and aſcribes the firſt to the face of the country, which ſhould as naturally have been the cauſe of the ſecond. This lets the Gael, who muſt have ſeen the cliffs of the iſland for ages, totally overlook the denominating appearance of it to the eye; and yet forces it afterwards upon the Cimbri. And this fixes not a name upon the country before it was inhabited, though its appearance muſt neceſſarily have compelled a name ſome ages before; and afterwards fetches a name from its appearance, when it had now been inhabited for ages, and when it had already acquired a name from its nature. — But it ſeems to ſhew ſomething worſe than inattention, to give neither the Gael nor the Cimbri any other ideas of a country than merely the marſhes of Holland, to attribute the name of Albion to the Gael and of Britain to the Cimbri, to have the former appellation impoſed after their ſettlement in the country, and to have the latter affixed before their migration into it; and to advance all this without one ſingle argument or authority, real or pretended.—I proceed, however, to the etymology itſelf.

In the Hiſtory of Mancheſter I have ſhewn from Pliny, that Britain was not the peculiar

and

and appropriate name of Albion [1]. It was common to all the iſlands about it. Albion ipſi nomen fuit, cum Britanniæ vocarentur omnes [2]. And Mr. Macpherſon's etymology is overthrown at the firſt onſet.—In the Hiſtory of Mancheſter I have equally ſhewn from Richard, that Britain was not the name of the iſland originally [3]. It was the appellation of the iſlanders. Vocabulo gentis ſuæ Britanniam cognominaverunt [4]. And Mr. Macpherſon's etymology is again overthrown.

The real etymon ſeems to be what is propoſed in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter [5]. Perhaps I am partial to it as my own. And I will therefore endeavour to open it more fully, and to examine it more attentively, than I did before.

Albion is obviouſly derived from the view of the coaſt, before it had been viſited from the continent. Britain therefore, as the ſecondary name, was undoubtedly affixed to the country at or after the firſt migration into it. While it was only ſeen from the ſhores of Gaul, the name of Albion muſt have continued, as the moſt natural denomination of the country. And when it came to be ſettled, when a body of Gauls had actually migrated acroſs the ſea with their wives and children into it, they would ſtill uſe the name

[1] P. 9. [2] L. iv. c. 16. And Ptolemy accordingly calls Ireland and Albion equally a Britiſh iſland. [3] P. 9. [4] P. 1. And Iſidore ſays the ſame. [5] P. 8—10.

for the country which they had uſed for ages before in Gaul; and Albion accordingly remained the regular appellation of the iſland. But the new coloniſts would naturally be diſtinguiſhed, among their brethren and themſelves, by ſome denomination expreſſive of their remove acroſs the Channel, and of their ſeparation from the great body of their countrymen in Gaul. The idea, of their disjunction from Gaul, would naturally be the firſt that would preſent itſelf to the mind. And the idea, of our ſeparation from the continent of Europe, always appears a leading one in the language of the antients concerning us. This then muſt naturally have vented itſelf in ſome appellation of disjunction, for the coloniſts that croſſed the Channel into Britain. And they could ſcarcely avoid calling themſelves, and being called by their brethren, the Separated or Divided Perſons. An etymon therefore, expreſſive of this idea, muſt be the firſt that is ſought for by a judicious enquirer into the meaning of Britain. And any eaſy etymology, that is expreſſive of this idea, muſt for that reaſon be ſuperior to every other. Such is the etymology, that is offered in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter.

The primitive and radical word in the name of Britain, is obviouſly Brit. One of our iſlanders is repeatedly denominated Brit-o and Britt-us

by the Romans, and Bryt by the Saxons [1]. This then is the original word. And this is the very word which Mr. Camden has equally ſelected, but interpreted to ſignify Painted, and to allude to the well-known cuſtom of the Britons. — Appellations deſcriptive of manners, as I have previouſly obſerved, are never the firſt and primary deſignations of any people. They are the reſult of attention to them, and the conſequence of obſervations upon them. And long before the untutored and unreflecting mind could catch the characteriſtic quality of a people, it muſt of courſe have taken up with ſome ſenſible and exterior diſcrimination of them. And where one nation migrated immediately from another, as the Britons from the Gauls, and where the new coloniſts could have no communication for ages with any but their brethren in Gaul, there no names characteriſtic of manners could poſſibly ariſe. Having no diſſimilarity of manners, they could not poſſibly diſtinguiſh each other by it. And the Britons muſt have brought the cuſtom of painting, as well as all their other cuſtoms, originally with them from Gaul.—Nor does Brith properly ſignify Painted. This is merely the poſterior and

[1] In Stukeley's Carauſius, V. I. p. 268, we have two Roman Inſcriptions, found on the banks of the Rhine, and addreſſed Matribus Brittis. And ſee Saxon Chronicle, p. 15, &c.

derivative

derivative ſignification of the word. It is Brith in Welſh, Brit in Iriſh, and Breact [1], Breac, and Bryk, in Erſe, Iriſh, and Welſh; and primarily meant any thing Divided. This is evident from the preſent meaning of the word in many of its derivatives, in the Iriſh Brioth a Fraction, Brath a Fragment, and Bracaim to break aſunder, in the Scotch Bris a Rupture, and in the Welſh Breg a Breach, Bradwy a Fracture, Briw a Fragment, Briwo to break into fragments, and Bradwyog and Brwyd Broken [2]. Carrying with it originally the ſingle idea of diviſion, it was afterwards, by the natural aſſimilation of ideas in the human mind, applied to every thing that preſented the idea of a diviſion. It was firſt applied probably, as in the Iriſh and Highland Breacan, to the ſtriped mantles of plaid. And, from the colours in regular diviſions upon the plaids, it was transferred to objects that were but diſperſedly marked with colours; and Brith, Brit, Breact, Breac, and Bryk came to ſignify Particoloured, Speckled, and Spotted. Thus Breac ſtands for any thing ſpeckled or a Trout, Breicin for a ſmall Trout, Britineach or Brittinnios for the Meazles, in the Iriſh at preſent; Brech is ap-

[1] Oſſian, V. I. p. 210. a note.

[2] So alſo in the Welſh, Breichio, to take part with any one, Brau and Breuol, Frangible, and Breuolaeth and Breuawd, Frangibility, and in our Anglo-Britiſh word Brittle or Frangible.

plied to the Small Pox in Armoric; and Breok, Brethal, Brethil, or Brethel, are uſed for a Mackerel, Brethyl for a Trout, and Brag-ado for a pied ox, in the Manks, the Corniſh, the Armoric, the Welſh, and the Mountain Spaniſh. And hence it came to ſignify a Painted object, but ſuch an one only as was coloured merely by parts. This deduction plainly evinces the original and primary idea of the word, and ſhows from the current meaning of it in all its derivatives, and from the regular analogy of all languages, that it could never have ſignified Painting, if it had not firſt imported a Diviſion. This then is the true meaning of the word Brit. And it leads us directly to the natural appellation of a people, that had migrated from their brethren, and were divided from them by the ſea.

The original word appears above to have been equally pronounced Briſt, Brit, and Brioth, Breact, Breac, and Brig; and appears from the Gallic Breſche a Rupture, the Iriſh Bris to Break and Briſead a Breach, the Welſh Briwſion Fragments, and the Armorican Breizell, as well as Brethel, a Mackerel, to have been ſometimes ſoftened into Bris or Breis. And the word occurs with all this variety of terminations in the Iriſh Breattain or Breatin, Britain, and in Breathnach, Briotnach, and Breagnach, a Briton; in the Armorican names of Breton, Breiz,

Breiz, and Brezonnec, for an individual, the country, and the language, of Armorica; in the Welſh Brython and Brythoneg, the Britons, and their language; and in the antient ſynonimous appellations of Brigantes and Britanni. Theſe I have previouſly ſhewn to be ſynonimous, by demonſtrating the Britons all over the iſland to have been, equally with the Britons of Yorkſhire and Durham, denominated Brigantes as well as Britanni. And in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter I have ſhewn the Brigantes of thoſe two counties, to have been peculiarly denominated Britanni alſo [1].

The national appellation of Brit therefore imports, not the inſular nature of Albion, by which it was ſeparated from all the world, but merely its disjunction from Gaul. The former could not be known for ages after the name muſt have been impoſed. And the latter was an obvious and ſtriking particularity. The Gael or Wealas of the continent paſſing over into Albion, they would naturally be denominated, as they are actually and repeatedly denominated in the Saxon Chronicle, the Bryt-Wealas or the Bryttas [2]. But how ſhall we lengthen Brit into Britanni and Britones? We cannot with

[1] P. 10. [2] See p. 2. and 18, &c. And the ſea, which they paſſed over into this iſland, appears upon the ſame principle to have been called by the Britons, for ages afterward, Muir Ict, or the Great Separation. See Uſher, p. 429. Edit. 1687.

Camden call in the Greek ταινια, for a country, to our aid. And we muſt not with Pezron and Carte adopt the equivalent Tain of the Celtic. The name of Britain, as I have ſhewn above, was the appellation of the iſlanders, before it was the denomination of the iſland. And the want of attention to the Genius of the Britiſh language has created all the difficulty. It inſtantly vaniſhes, the moment we remark the manner in which the Britiſh words ſhoot out in the Plural. Briſt or Brit is enlarged into Brit-on or Brit-an, and therefore, in the antient and modern uſe of the word, is ſometimes Brits [1], Bracht, Brecht [2], and Britt-i, in the Plural, but more commonly Bryth-on; Brit-on-es, and Brit-ann-i, and, in the relative adjectives, Brit-iſh, Breathn-ach, Briotn-ach, Brython-eg, and Brit-ann-ic-i. And the equivalent Brag or Brig is formed, on the ſame principles, into Brig-an or Brig-ant in the Plural, and therefore appears ſometimes as Brig-as, and Brog-es, ſometimes as Breag-n, and Brig-ian-i [4], but generally Brig-ant-es, and, in the relative adjectives, Breagn-ach and Brig-ant-ic [3].

This is a plain and obvious derivation of the name of Britain. It reſults from that ſtriking

[1] Camden, p. 20. [2] Carte, V. I. p. 25. a note.

[3] Stephanus Byzantinus Lugd. Bat. 1694, p. 245, and Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 9. [4] Pliny, lib. iii. c. 20.

peculiarity

peculiarity in the poſition of the natives, which muſt neceſſarily have denominated the new coloniſts of Albion. And it is deduced from no foreign language, which could not poſſibly have any relation to the name, but flows natural and eaſy from the Celtic.

P. 39. "This new name [Britain] never extended itſelf to the Gael of North Britain; "and the poſterity of the Cimbri have loſt it in "the progreſs of time. The Scottiſh and Iriſh "Gael have brought down the name of Alba or "Albin to the preſent age: the Welſh uſe no "general appellation. The æra of its impoſition "ought to be fixed as far back as the arrival of "the Cimbri in the iſland."

In the paragraph immediately preceding this, the name of Britain was impoſed upon the iſland when the Cimbri were yet in Gaul, and before they migrated into Britain. "The Cimbri —, "arriving in Belgium, and deſcrying Albion, "gave it a new name —, comparing the elevated "coaſt of Britain to the fenny plains of the Lower "Germany." But it is here fixed after the Cimbri had for ſome time beheld the high lands of Albion, after they had left Gaul, and even after they had arrived in the iſland. "The "æra of its impoſition ought to be fixed as far

" back as the arrival of the Cimbri in the iſland." How contradictory is this!

And that the name of Britain never extended itſelf to the Gael of North Britain, and is loſt among the Cimbri; and that the name of Albion is the only one, which has been brought down to the preſent age by the Scottiſh and Iriſh Gael; are all groſs miſtakes, miſtakes too in facts where one would leaſt expect them, from a gentleman ſo converſant in the Celtic language, who ſpeaks the Erſe as a native, and has ſtudied it as a critick. With regard to the Iriſh and Scottiſh Gael, the reverſe of Mr. Macpherſon's aſſertion is the real truth. They have brought down the name of Britain to the preſent age. And they have not brought down the name of Albion. They retain indeed Alban or Albain for the appellation of their own country: but they are totally ignorant of it as the name of the whole iſland. And I have ſhewn before, that the appellatives Britain and Britannic ſtill continue in the Erſe, the common language of the Scotch and the Iriſh, and in the words Breattain, Breatin, Breatnach, and Briotnach. Nor is the name loſt among the Welſh, the only part of Mr. Macpherſon's Cimbri that ſpeak the Britiſh language at preſent. It was uſed in the name of Prydæn among his Cimbri of Brigantia, in the days of Llomarch Hen [*]; and in the name of Prudain

[*] Lhuyd, p. 219.

among

among his Cimbri of Wales, in the earlier days of Pabo [r]. And it exiſts in the Welſh Prydhain and the Corniſh Prydein, the Welſh Brython and Brythoneg, and the Armorican Brezon and Brezonnec, to the preſent period. The new name of Britain, therefore, extended itſelf to Mr. Macpherſon's Gael, both in Caledonia and in Ireland, as it remains in the common language of both to the preſent day. And the name of Britain muſt, for that reaſon, not have been impoſed upon the iſland, by any body of coloniſts that were diſtinct from, and even in hoſtility with, the Gael. It muſt have been affixed from ſome principle of diſcrimination that equally affected all, and muſt have been adopted by all as the one national note of diſtinction. And it accordingly appears to have been common to every diviſion of the iſlanders. Given and aſſumed at the firſt migration of coloniſts into Albion, as the natural ſignature of their ſequeſtration from their brethren in Gaul; it was never the denomination either impoſed or retained excluſively by a part, but was at once coæval with the plantation of the iſland, and commenſurate with the colonies of the iſlanders.

[r] Mona, p. 158, ſecond Edit.

II. CON-

II.

CONCERNING MR. MACPHERSON'S FIRST POPULATION OF IRELAND BY THE CALEDONIANS.

PAG. 41. "The Cimbri and Belgæ, after "they were comprehended within the pale "of the Roman dominions, were ſeen diſtinctly; "but the more ancient inhabitants of the iſland, "the Gael, appeared only tranſiently, when, in "an hoſtile manner, they advanced to the fron- "tiers of the province. The arms of the empire "penetrated, at different periods, into the heart "of the country beyond the Scottiſh Friths; "but as theſe expeditions were not attended "with abſolute conqueſt, and a conſequent ſet- "tlement of colonies, the Romans made little "inquiry concerning the origin and hiſtory of "the natives of the northern diviſion of Bri- "tain."

I do not love to ſuppoſe contradictions in an author of Mr. Macpherſon's merit, and eſpecially within

within the compaſs only of a few lines. It ſeems ſo unlikely, that I am rather inclined to diſbelieve the ſuggeſtions of my own judgement. And yet I have already obſerved ſuch an haſtineſs in the compoſition of the preſent work, and ſome contradictions which, ſeemingly at leaſt, are ſo groſs, that I cannot give up my feelings to an affectation of fairneſs, and ſacrifice preciſion to politeneſs.—We are here firſt told, that the Gael appeared only tranſiently to the Romans, when in an hoſtile manner they advanced to the frontiers of the Roman province. And yet immediately afterwards we are told, that the Romans penetrated at different periods into the heart of their country. Is not this contradictory? And is not the whole paſſage in direct oppoſition to another in p. 22, 23? We are here aſſured, that the Cimbri and Belgæ were, and that the Gael were not, ſeen diſtinctly by the Romans. But there we find, that "the information of the Romans accompanied the "progreſs of their arms; new communities roſe "gradually before them as they advanced into "the heart of the iſland; till *the whole body* "of its inhabitants came forward *diſtinctly* to "view, when Agricola carried the Roman eagles "to the mountains of Caledonia."

The great poſition in this extract is, that the Caledonians were but little known to the Romans, becauſe they were never comprehended within

within the pale of the Roman empire. The fact is not true. And the reaſoning is not juſt.

Many nations were well-known to the Romans, that were never comprehended within the pale of their empire. Ireland is a remarkable inſtance of this, where we have all the tribes recited, all the towns enumerated, and all the headlands and rivers ſpecified, equally as in the provinces of Britain. As the Roman empire extended itſelf upon every ſide, the Roman geographers and hiſtorians enlarged the circle of their obſervations, gained an acquaintance with all the nations that bordered upon their frontiers, and carried their reſearches where the arms of their countrymen never penetrated. And Mr. Macpherſon in another place, and to ſerve another purpoſe, not only allows but contends for it. "It is morally impoſſible," ſays he in p. 190, "that a migration ſufficient to people Caledonia "and *Ireland*, could have happened, without "falling within the knowledge of the writers of "Rome, who *certainly extended their enquiries to "the tranſactions of the wild nations on the fron-"tiers of the empire.*"

But the fact is not true, that the Caledonians were unknown to the Romans, becauſe they were never comprehended within the empire. Since ſome of them were comprehended, thoſe muſt have been fully known, as fully as the Cimbri and

and the Belgæ. Since ſeveral of them were, ſeveral muſt have been known as fully. As many were reduced by the Romans, the Romans muſt have been converſant with a conſiderable part of Caledonia. And as the greater part of the tribes ſubmitted to their power, the greater part of the country muſt have been open to their obſervations. That this was actually the caſe, may be eaſily ſhewn. The Gael or Caledonians are placed by Mr. Macpherſon, before, in the large diviſion of the iſland which runs from the Tweed to the Orkneys. "The Cimbri," he ſays in p. 32, "— poſſeſſed — the country — from the "Humber to the Tweed. The Gael, under the "general name of Caledonians, inhabited the "reſt of the iſland to the extremity of the North." Now this region comprehended no leſs than twenty-one tribes [1]. And no fewer than eleven of theſe had been actually ſubdued by the Romans, and brought within the pale of their empire, being formed into the province of Valentia to the South of the Friths, and of Veſpaſiana to the North of them [2]. Veſpaſiana continued a province from the year 140 to 170 [3]. And Valentia remained one, from the days of Agricola to the late period of the Roman departure [4]. The

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 63, and 409—411.
[2] Ibid. [3] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 419.
[4] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 453—458.

Gael

Gael therefore, that reſided to the South of the Friths, not only appeared to the Romans by advancing frequently to the frontiers of the provinces, but were all engaged with the Romans, were all ſubdued by them, and were all reduced into a province. They did not merely appear tranſiently and occaſionally to them, but were actually invaded, actually conquered, and actually retained in ſubjection for no leſs than three centuries and a half. They were equally comprehended within the circle of the Roman empire as the Cimbri and the Belgæ, were equally comprehended with both in the firſt century, and equally continued in it with both to the middle of the fifth. And, as to the Gael that lay to the North of the Friths, even many of theſe, no leſs than ſix whole tribes, were entirely ſubdued by the Romans; the Horeſtii, the Vecturiones, the Taixali, the Vacomagi, the Damnii Albani, and the Attacotti [1]: and the Romans proſecuted their conqueſts, over the mountains of Athol and Badenoch, as far as Inverneſs. No colonies indeed were ſettled there, as none alſo were ſettled in Valentia. Colonies were not the neceſſary conſequence of abſolute conqueſt. Stations only were. And numerous ſtations were planted to the North of the Friths, as Alauna, Lindum, and

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 410.

Victoria,

Victoria, among the Horeſtii; Orrea, Ad Hiernam, Ad Tavum, Ad Eſicam, and Ad Tinam, among the Vecturiones; and others in Strathern, Menteith, Badenoch, Braidalbin, Athol, and Inverneſs [1]. The Romans therefore, who had penetrated into the center of the Highlands, who ſettled in all the conquered regions from the Friths to Inverneſs, and who even made an aſtronomical obſervation, which is ſtill preſerved, at the town of Inverneſs [2], could not be ignorant of the countries in which they reſided, could not be uninformed concerning the region which immediately bordered upon them, and muſt have been ſufficiently converſant with all Caledonia. Intimately acquainted, as they were, with the interiors of an iſland which they had never viſited at all, Ireland; they muſt have been much better acquainted with the interiors of Caledonia, in the heart of which they were encamped for thirty years together, and where their ſcholars appear to have been particularly obſervant.

Mr. Macpherſon's remark therefore, that his Caledonians were little known to the Romans, becauſe they appeared only tranſiently upon the frontiers of their empire, or becauſe they were never abſolutely reduced by their armies, appears to be equally unjuſt in the reaſoning and falſe in

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 409, 410.
[2] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 56.

the

the fact. The Romans were well acquainted with Ireland, though they never visited it. The Romans actually reduced three fourths of Mr. Macpherson's Caledonians. The Romans must have been well acquainted with a people, with whom, as friends or as enemies, they had a continual and uninterrupted intercourse of nearly four centuries. And the Romans have actually left us a very particular account of all the tribes of Caledonia, in Ptolemy and in Richard.

P. 41, 42. "Julius Agricola, who, for the "first time, displayed the Roman eagles beyond "the Friths, was not more successful in the field "than he was happy in an historian to transmit "his actions with luster to posterity. But even "the distinct and intelligent Tacitus gives but a "very imperfect idea of those enemies, by the "defeat of whom his father-in-law acquired so "much reputation. We learn from him indeed "that the Caledonians were the most antient in-"habitants of Britain."

Here the author evidently fixes the Caledonians beyond the Friths. And yet, as I have shewed in the last article, he brings them in p. 32. down as low as the Tweed. How inaccurate! — And here is also another great inaccuracy. From Tacitus we learn, if we may ascribe the speech of

of Galgacus to him, not that the Caledonians were the moſt antient inhabitants of Britain, but that they were the moſt honourable, nobiliſſimi totius Britanniæ. And flouriſhes like that, in ſuch addreſſes as Galgacus's, it is idle to adduce for an hiſtorical authority.

P. 42—44. "This is the ſum of what the "Romans have related concerning the Caledo- "nians for near two centuries after they were "firſt mentioned: to their origin and internal "hiſtory they were equally ſtrangers. — Had "the Romans eſtabliſhed themſelves in Caledonia, "we might indeed have known more of the an- "tient inhabitants of that country —. The firſt "domeſtic writers of the hiſtory of North Bri- "tain were too ignorant, as well as too modern, "to form any probable ſyſtem concerning the "origin of their nation."

I have already ſhewn, that the Romans did eſtabliſh themſelves in Caledonia, and that they reduced one half even of the genuine Caledonians, the Britons to the North of the Friths. And as to the ignorance of the Romans, concerning the interior hiſtory and origin of the Caledonians before their invaſion, they were alſo ignorant of the interior hiſtory

and origin of the Britons in general. Whence the Britons were derived, when they came into the iſland, and how they gradually diffuſed their ſpreading numbers to the fartheſt promontories of Caledonia, was all equally unknown to them.

P. 47, 48. "In proportion as the Cimbri advanced towards the North, the Gael, being "circumſcribed within narrower limits, were "forced to tranſmigrate into the iſlands which "crowd the Northern and Weſtern coaſts of "Scotland. It is in this period, perhaps, we "ought to place the firſt great migration of the "Britiſh Gael into Ireland; that kingdom being "much nearer to the promontory of Galloway "and Cantyre, than many of the Scottiſh iſles "are to the continent of North Britain. This "vicinity of Ireland had probably drawn par-"tial emigrations from Caledonia before the arri-"val of the Cimbri in Britain; but when theſe "interlopers preſſed upon the Gael from the "South, it is reaſonable to conclude that nu-"merous colonies paſſed over into an iſland ſo "near, and ſo much ſuperior to their original "country in climate and fertility."

I have already demonſtrated, that no colony of the Cimbri, as diſtinct and different from the Gael

Gael, ever landed in the iſland. And, conſequently, all the tranſactions attributed to them muſt be abſolutely falſe. This ſeries of ſuppoſitions therefore is a chain of errors. As the Cimbri never advanced towards the North, the Gael could not have been circumſcribed within narrower limits, or forced to tranſmigrate into the weſtern iſles of Scotland. As no ſuch interlopers ever preſſed upon the Gael, no colonies of them, either ſmall or numerous, could have been induced by it to paſs over into Ireland.

But I am obliged here to remark again the author's apparent inconſiſtency, with regard to the poſition of his Gael. In p. 32 they are ranged from the banks of the Tweed to the northern extremity of the iſland. In p. 41—44 they are ranged only to the North of the Friths. Here, in p. 47, they are brought down as low as Galloway again. And in p. 48 they are once more carried back to the Friths. It is there ſaid, that, when the Belgæ "drove the Cimbri beyond "the Severne and Humber, the Gael of the "North, reduced within limits ſtill more cir-"cumſcribed by the preſſure of the Cimbri, ſent "freſh colonies into Ireland, while *the Scottiſh* "*Friths became a natural and ſtrong boundary to-*"*wards the South to thoſe Gael who remained in* "*Britain.*" And yet at this very period, even when the Cimbri inhabited betwixt the Humber and the Tweed, the Gael are ſaid before to have

reached from the Tweed to the North. "The "Cimbri, — retiring from the preſſure of theſe "new invaders [the Belgæ], poſſeſſed the coun- "try — from the Humber to the Tweed. The "Gael, under the general name of Caledonians, "inhabited the reſt of the iſland to the extremity "of the North [1]." So unſettled is the author in his notions concerning the Britiſh topography of the iſland, and ſo varying and contradictory in his repreſentations of it.

P. 48. "The inhabitants of the maritime re- "gions of Gaul croſſing, in an after age [after "the Cimbri], the Britiſh channel (*maritima pars* "Britanniæ *ab iis*, qui prædæ ac belli inferendi "causâ, ex Belgis tranſierant : . . . et bello il- "lato ibi remanſerunt, atque agros colere coepe- "runt. Cæſar de Bell. Gall. lib. v.), eſtabliſhed "themſelves on that part of our iſland which lies "neareſt to the continent ; and, moving gradu- "ally towards the North, drove the Cimbri be- "yond the Severn and Humber."

I have brought this paſſage out to view, merely to ſhew one among many inſtances of Mr. Macpherſon's ſtrange behaviour towards his quotations. He aſſerts the Belgæ to have carried their poſſeſſions up to the Humber. And he aſſerts

[1] P. 32.

it

it upon the ſtrength of a quotation, of which he has italiciſed the principal words; when that very quotation, and thoſe very words, do in the fulleſt manner confine the Belgæ to the ſouthern ſhore. This is ſurely a very extraordinary ſpecimen of inattention and inaccuracy.

P. 48, 49. "It was, perhaps, after the Belgic invaſion of the Southern Britain, that "the Gael of the Northern diviſion formed "themſelves into a regular community, to repel "the incroachment of the Cimbri upon their "territories. To the country which they themſelves poſſeſſed they gave the name of CAEL-"DOCH, which is the only appellation the "Scots, who ſpeak the Galic language, know "for their own diviſion of Britain. CAEL-"DOCH is a compound made up of Gael or "Caël, the firſt colony of the antient Gauls "who tranſmigrated into Britain, and DOCH, "a diſtrict or diviſion of a country. The Ro-"mans, by tranſpoſing the letter L in Caël, "and by ſoftening into a Latin termination the "*ch* of DOCH, formed the well-known name "of Caledonia. Obvious as this Etymon of "Caledonia appears, it was but very lately diſ-"covered. (This Etymon firſt occurred to the "author of this Eſſay, and he communicated

" it to Dr. Macpherſon, who adopted it from " a conviction of its juſtneſs). Thoſe who " treated of the antiquities of North Britain " were utter ſtrangers to that only name by which " the Scots diſtinguiſhed the corner of Britain " which their Anceſtors poſſeſſed from the re- " moteſt antiquity. From an ignorance, ſo un- " pardonable in antiquaries, proceeded that er- " roneous ſyſtem, &c. [1]."

I have made this large extract, to exhibit the whole argument in all its force, and, I may add, in all its oſtentation too. And I ſhall now endeavour to ſhew the reaſonings to be as feeble and the etymons as injudicious, even in this triumphant paſſage, as in any that I have diſſected before.

The aſſertions in this paragraph are theſe, That the Caledonians perhaps firſt formed themſelves into one community, to repel the incroachments of the Cimbri; That a proof of this incorporation remains in the word Caeldoch, which ſignifies the Diſtrict of the Gael; and, That this word is the Latin Caledonia. Each ſhall be conſidered diſtinctly.

The incroachments of the Cimbri muſt be as imaginary, as the reſt of their hiſtory. And any aſſociation of the Caledonians, to repel them,

[1] This Etymon is in Dr. Macpherſon, p. 27. and 100.— And he makes the ſame uſe of the name of Gael in p. 97, 98, and of Caeldoch in p. 100.

muſt

muſt be equally viſionary with both. The firſt time that the Caledonians embodied into one empire, was aſſuredly the period which is aſſigned for it in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter [1]. The Romans under Agricola were certainly the firſt common enemy, which had hitherto attacked them. Nothing but ſuch an attack could have induced them to form themſelves into one monarchy. And into one monarchy they actually firſt formed themſelves at that period. Æſtate quâ ſextum officii annum inchoabat [Agricola], amplas civitates trans Bodotriam ſitas, *quia motus univerſarum ultra gentium*, et infeſta hoſtili exercitu itinera, *timebantur*, prius claſſe exploravit [2]. In the commencement of the 6th year of Agricola's Proconſulate therefore, or in the ſpring of the year 83, the Caledonians were not yet aſſociated into one community. Agricola only apprehended that they would ſpeedily aſſociate, as the danger became more imminent to all. And in this and the year following they actually combined. Ad manus et arma converſi Caledoniam incolentes populi;—nihil remittere, quo minus juventutem armarent, conjuges ac liberos in loca tuta transferrent, cœtibus ac ſacrificiis conſpirationem civitatum ſancirent; *tandem*--docti commune periculum concordiâ propulſandum [3]. The Caledonians therefore did

[1] P. 414. [2] Agric. V. c. 25. [3] C. 25, 27, and 29.

not model their tribes into one community, in conſequence of the Cimbric incroachments upon them. There were no ſuch incroachments made. And there were no Cimbri, or German Celtæ, to make them. The Caledonians actually embodied together long after the æra aſſigned for it by Mr. Macpherſon, when Agricola threatened the reduction of all their tribes.

Nor is the name of Caeldoch, now uſed by the Highlanders to ſignify their country, any proof of ſuch an aſſociation. It is no proof of any aſſociation at all. And the etymon, which is here diſplayed with ſuch an air of conſequence, and with ſuch a reflection upon the ignorance of others, is obviouſly unjuſt in itſelf. This will eaſily appear.—I have previouſly ſhewn Gathel to be pronounced ſimilarly to Gael by the Iriſh and Highlanders. And Gathel is alſo changed, as I have equally remarked, into Galath, Galat, Galt, and Celt. It is alſo changed into Gaellt, Gallt, Gaeld, and Gald[1]. This we ſee directly exemplified in the Gael of the continent and of the iſland being univerſally denominated Galatæ and Celtæ by the Græcians, Gallt and

[1] See Buchanan, p. 34, 35. and p. 61. V. I. Ruddiman, who informs us, that the Scotch uſe the word Gald for a Gaul. And ſee alſo Gauld-i and Gaelti, and even Gaeltach, in Dr. Macpherſon, p. 98, 99. — From the word Gald is derived the name for Galgacus in the Scotch Romances, Galdus. — And ſee Irwin's Hiſt. Scot. Nomen-clatura Latino-vernacula, 1682, p. 83.

Gallta

Gallta by the Iriſh, and Gaelt, Gallt, and Gald by the Highlanders. And the relative adjective of this word is the very name, which Mr. Macpherſon has ſo ingeniouſly diſtorted here. Gael and Cael lengthening into Gal-ek and Cael-ich, Gallt muſt be formed into Gallt-ach, and Gaeld into Gaeld-ach. And we actually have Gallt-ach in the Iriſh language, the appellation for a Gaul at preſent. Gaeld-och and Gallt-ach therefore are one and the ſame word, the relative adjectives of the ſame national appellation, Gaeld and Gallt; and, in the ſpirit of all other relative adjectives, refer equally to an individual, the language, or the country, of France and Scotland. Thus eaſily is the mighty ſpell diſſolved, which held both Dr. and Mr. Macpherſon in abſolute bondage. And thus readily is the great fabrick deſtroyed, which was raiſed by the magic hand of error, equally ſlight in its ſtructure, and momentary in its continuance.

That Caeldoch is the very ſame word with Caledonia, is another of Mr. Macpherſon's poſitions. But it is equally a miſtake. And I hope convincingly to prove it. I ſhall lay before the reader what I have ſaid upon this ſubject in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter, and I ſhall make ſome additions to it.—I have previouſly ſhewn the words Gathel, Gael, Galat, Galt, Gaeld, and Celt, to be all one and the ſame appellation. And though Mr. Macpherſon

Macpherſon in p. 10 ſeems inclined to derive one of them, Gaul, from the Celtic Geal, Fair, a deſignation evidently too effeminate for the bold and ferocious Celtæ; they all ſignify a Woodlander. Geil-t, Guylh-t, and Guel-z, among the Iriſh, the Welſh, and the Armoricans, import a Man of the Kelli, Guylh, or Gnel, a Wood; all of them the evident remains of the antient and obſolete Gui*dh*il or Gue*th*el a Wood. And ſeveral woods in Wales are actually denominated Cottel to this day[1]. Coil, the ſame with the Cottel, the Guylh, and the Kelli, of the Welſh, and anſwering to Gathel, Gael, and Cael, is the cuſtomary term for a Wood among the Iriſh and Highlanders at preſent. And Gulad occurs in Gulad-ædh, the Welſh for a Woodlander; Kelyd appears in Kelydhon, the Britiſh for Woods; and Gelht remains undiſguiſed in the Welſh language at preſent; all correſponding to Galat, Galt, Gaeld, and Celt, and all ſignifying with them a Wood. The celebrated appellations therefore of Gathel-i, Galat-æ, Calet-es, An-Calit-es, and Celtæ, all import a Wood only. And bearing the Celtic prefix before them, which is uſed in the antient Hiſtory of Ireland, as Fir-Bolg and Fir-Damnon, and which is equally uſed in this very appellation by the Iriſh of the preſent moment, as Gallta or Fear-Gallta; the denomina-

[1] Mr. Lhuyd in N°. 2. Appendix to Nicholſon's Scottiſh Hiſt. Library.

tions

tions of Fir-Galat, Fir-Galt, Fir-Gaeld, and Fir-Celt muſt have ſignified merely the Man of the Wood. But, in two national denominations of the very ſame origin, the termination is a little different, becauſe the words are in the plural number, or ſtand as the relative adjective. Kelyd or Caled lengthens into Kelyd-on or Caled-on, Woods; and Gallt or Gaeld is formed into Gallt-ach or Gaeld-och, Woodland-iſh. Thus Caledon became the antient appellation for all the extenſive Foreſts of the Gatheli and the Galli in the provinces of Britain; from the Foreſt of Anderida in Kent, Suſſex, and ſeveral other counties, into which, under the name of the Caledonian Woods, Florus ſays that Cæſar purſued the Britons; to the Foreſt of the Coritani in Lincolnſhire and ſome adjoining counties, to which, under the ſame denomination of the Caledonian Wood, Pliny ſays that the Roman arms had been carried in his time; and to the well-known Caledonian Foreſt of Scotland [1]. Thus Fir-Caledon, or Caledones, and the equivalent Gaeld-och, became equally the antient and preſent appellations for the Gathel and the Gael of the Highlands. And thus Caledonius became occaſionally among the Romans a denomination equivalent to Britannicus, and was applied equally

[1] Florus, L. iii. c. 10. Caledonias ſecutus in ſilvas; Pliny, L. iv. c. 16; and Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p 415, and 337.

with

with it to all the Gathel and Gael in the iſland [1].— The word Caeldoch therefore is very different from the word Caledonia. Derived from the ſame root, and carrying the ſame power, they are very different branches. The one is a relative adjective; the other is a Noun Subſtantive. The one is derived from Gaeld in the ſingular; the other is deduced from Caledon in the plural. And the one is the ſame word with Celticus, and the other with Galatarum.

I have been thus particular upon the ſubject, becauſe it is of ſome conſequence in itſelf, and Mr. Macpherſon introduces it with ſuch a fond regard. And I think that I have fully demonſtrated Mr. Macpherſon's reaſonings and etymons to be advanced, equally in oppoſition to the voice of hiſtory, and to the principles of the Celtic language.

P. 49, 50. — " Concerning the internal " ſtate of Caledonia, and the diviſion of its inha- " bitants into various tribes in a very early

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 439, 440. — And there is an additional proof of it, that has never been noticed, in theſe lines of Lucan, in which the Caledonians are firſt mentioned in hiſtory, and which call the Britons about Richborough Caledonians:

Aut vaga cum Tethys Rutupinaque littora fervent,
Unda Caledonios fallit turbata Britannos.

" period,

" period, we can find nothing certain. The " account given by Ptolemy of the Epidii, Ca- " rini, Cantæ, Logæ, and other nations, is little " to be regarded. Tacitus paſſed over thoſe " petty communities in ſilence ; and in the period " between the expedition of Julius Agricola, " and the reign of Marcus Aurelius, under " whom the Egyptian geographer flouriſhed, " the Romans had no opportunity of being " acquainted with the domeſtic arrangements of " the Caledonians."

In this paſſage Mr. Macpherſon rejects Ptolemy's account of the internal ſtate of Caledonia, and of its diviſion into various tribes, becauſe Tacitus paſſes over theſe communities in ſilence; and becauſe, from the days of Tacitus to the time of Ptolemy, the Romans had no opportunity of knowing the domeſtic arrangements of the Caledonians. The former is ſurely a very trifling reaſon. And the latter is certainly a falſe fact.

The ſilence of Tacitus, concerning the tribes of Caledonia, is no proof that he was not acquainted with the diviſions. He has not even ſpecified any of the tribes, that Agricola conquered from the Dee to the Friths. And yet Mr. Macpherſon will not deny the partition of the country into tribes, He actually acknowledges it in this very page and in p. 51, ſpeaking of

of the Selgovæ, the Gadeni, the Damnii, the Novantes, and the Ottadini, five of those tribes, and whom he knows only from Ptolemy. In p. 82 also he expressly quotes the authority of Ptolemy for the Brigantes, the Velaborii, the Cauci, and the Menapii, in Ireland; though the Romans never had any opportunity at all, in Mr. Macpherson's acceptation of the word, to know the interior division of the country. And in p. 63 he argues, that even the *manners* of the Irish must have been perfectly known to the Romans, though here he denies them to have known even the names and positions of the Caledonian tribes, and though he allows the Romans to have had continual wars with the one, and none at all with the other. So inconsistent is Mr. Macpherson with himself! So much does he warp with the variations and bearings of his favourite hypothesis!

The design of Tacitus and Ptolemy was very different. That was composing an historical narration of national transactions; this was writing a geographical account of the nations. The one was obliged to detail to us the names, the sites, and the towns, of the various tribes that crouded the face of the island. But the other was required only to give us general descriptions and general appellations, such notices only as were just sufficient to lend propriety and meaning to the actions, and to exhibit the actors and their

principles in a ſtrong point of view. Tacitus therefore does not enumerate the tribes of Caledonia; and Ptolemy does. Tacitus does not ſpecify any particular nations; but he ſpeaks expreſsly of them in general. And Mr. Macpherſon's argument again fails. Amplas civitates trans Bodotriam ſitas; motus univerſarum ultra gentium; Caledoniam incolentes populi; conſpirationem civitatum; and, omnium civitatum vires [1]. From the officers of Agricola, therefore, might the Romans have derived that knowledge of the domeſtic arrangements of the Caledonians, which Ptolemy has preſented to us. And, even additional to this ſource of intelligence, Ptolemy had the fineſt opportunity that ever a geographer had, of knowing the internal diſpoſition of Caledonia compleatly, from the remarkable war of which Mr. Macpherſon appears to be totally unapprized, the invaſion of Caledonia by Lollius Urbicus about the year 140, and the reduction of half of it beneath the dominion of the Romans [2]. And Ptolemy, as I have previouſly remarked, has actually given us an aſtronomical obſervation, which was made at Inverneſs, and which could have been made only in conſequence of that reduction.

[1] Agric. V. 25, 27, and 30.

[2] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 55, 56, and 418, 419.

P. 50. "Though the Scottiſh Friths are "generally allowed to have been the boundaries "of Caledonia towards the South, it is more than "probable that thoſe tribes who poſſeſſed the "country between the walls were principally "deſcended from the antient Gael. The names "of the Selgovæ and Gadeni, two petty com- "munities on the northern banks of the Solway "and Tweed, ſeem to ſtrengthen this ſuppoſi- "tion. They carry in their ſignification a proof "that the tribes who bore them were in a ſtate "of hoſtility with their neighbours the Ottadini "and Brigantes, which furniſhes a preſumption "that they derived their origin from a different "quarter. (Selgovæ is plainly Selgovich lati- "nized. Selgovich literally ſignifies *Hunters*, "in a metaphorical ſenſe *Plunderers* —. Gadeni "is plainly from *Gadechin*, Robbers; a name "which aroſe from the ſame love of depredation "with their friends and neighbours the Sel- "govæ [1].)"

I have more than once remarked already the ſtrange doubling of the preſent diſſertation, in ſometimes bringing down the Gael or Caledonians to the banks of the Tweed, and in ſometimes carrying them up to the North of the

[1] The ſame etymons of Selgovæ and Gadeni are given by Dr. Macpherſon in p. 112.

Friths.

Friths. And the ſame ſpirit occurs here again. We have before been informed poſitively and without heſitation, that "the Gael, under the "general name of Caledonians, inhabited from "the Tweed to the extremity of the North." But we are here informed, that their inhabiting from the Tweed to the Friths is only "more "than probable," that Mr. Macpherſon "ſup-"poſes it," and that there is "a preſumption" for it. The certainty in p. 32 is all dwindled away in p. 50. And as the reader proceeds in the work, and naturally expects a clearer light and ſtronger convictions, he finds his author himſelf faultering in his ſtyle, and becoming more dubious of his own poſitions.

The Caledonians were brought down at firſt to the Solway and the Tweed, and are occaſionally brought down at preſent, merely becauſe of the name of Galloway there; as the name of Cumberland occaſioned the Cimbri, before, to be planted betwixt the Humber and the Tweed. And the Caledonians were carried at firſt, and are occaſionally carried at preſent, to the North of the Friths, becauſe hiſtory expreſsly places them to the North. The two ſtrong and active principles, thus unwarily blended together, are continually ſtruggling for ſuperiority, and ſometimes the one colour and ſometimes the other predominates.—But the reaſon here adduced, for the reſidence of the Caledonians betwixt the

Walls, is even feebler and more trifling than the ſecret reaſon before. The names of Selgovæ and Gadeni, it is ſaid, *prove* the tribes to have been in a ſtate of hoſtility with the Cimbric Ottadini and Brigantes. But why not with the Caledonians? There is no more reaſon for that than this. And then the argument is not only repelled, but actually changes ſides, and militates directly againſt its maſter.

But I am tired with purſuing ſuch impertinencies. And yet others preſent themſelves before us. Mr. Macpherſon is greatly miſtaken both in his Geography and Etymology.—Selgovæ, he ſays, ſignifies Hunters, and metaphorically Robbers. But the metaphor is ſuch as contradicts every idea of propriety. And it is ſuch peculiarly, as no nation and age of Hunters could ever have tolerated. Selgovæ appears from Ptolemy to be Elgovæ with a Prefix, being written by him Selgovæ in one place and Elgovæ in another. And the root of the name is therefore to be ſought in Elgovæ, and is probably this. The æſtuary formed by the river Eden was pretty certainly denominated S, Alga, Av, or The Noble Water, as Ireland has been ſometimes denominated Inis Alga in Iriſh, and as a Peninſula on the banks of the Loſſie in Scotland ſeems to have been called Elgin formerly [1].

[1] So another peninſula, formed by the ſtreams of the

The

The name remains to this day in its prefent appellation of the SOLWAY Frith, as the antient name of Conovius continues in that of the Conway at prefent. And the tribe, that inhabited along the whole extended line of the æſtuary, was naturally denominated Fir-Elgovæ or Fir-Selgovæ, Men, or the Men, of the Great Water. — Gadeni is alſo interpreted Robbers, and to be the ſame word with the Iriſh Gadechin, Robbers. The real word in Iriſh, I believe, is not Gadechin, but Gaduighe a thief, and Gaduighen Thieves. And Gadeni plainly comes from Gadh or Cath a Fight, as Crutheni is derived from Cruth; and, like Camulo-genus, the name of a Gallic Hero in Cæſar [1], ſignifies the Men of the Battle, or the Warriours. And the Gadeni are therefore denominated the Cadeni, in a Roman-Britiſh inſcription diſcovered in the North [2].—Nor were the Gadeni bounded merely by the northern bank of the Tweed, or the Ottadini by the ſouthern, as Mr. Macpherſon places them. The Gadeni ranged from the Wall to the North of Lanerk. And the Ottadini, whom the Author ſuppoſes to lie all to the South of the Tweed, extended beyond it to the Friths [3]. Mr. Macpherſon's great diviſion of

Loſſie and the Spey, was called Inis, an iſland, having the two villages of Innes and Ince in it to this day.

[1] Cæſar, p. 164. [2] Horſeley, N°. 80. Northumberland.

[3] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 63.

the North to the Cimbri and the Gael is therefore entirely overturned, as his great partition of the South to the Cimbri and the Belgæ was overturned before. Thoſe whom he denominates Cimbri and oppoſes to the Gael, the Cimbric Ottadini of p. 51, lived only in a ſmall part of the country which he has aſſigned to the Cimbri, and poſſeſſed alſo a large portion of that region which he has allotted to the Gael. But this is not all. The whole " country between the " Walls" Mr. Macpherſon here reſigns up to the Gael, as the Selgovæ, the Gadeni, and others; whom he engages in hoſtility with, and therefore ſuppoſes to be of a different origin from, the Ottadini immediately to the South of the nearer Wall. But the whole body of the Ottadinian dominions, except a very ſmall ſlip of land along the ſouthern edge of Northumberland, was actually to the North of the nearer Wall [1]. Mr. Macpherſon cedes all " the country betwixt " the Walls" to his Gael, and therefore brings them down to the northern banks of the Solway and Tweed. But he is not aware, that the nearer Wall did not run from the Solway to the Tweed. It began on the Solway: but it ended on the Tyne.

Thus have I laid open the numerous miſtakes in this remarkable paſſage. I have ſhewn the

[1] Ibid.

reaſonings,

reaſonings, I think, to be at once arbitrary in their principles, and frivolous in their concluſions. And I have demonſtrated the Geography of the iſland, I think, to be at once falſe and contradictory.

P. 51. " As that tract of country which is " comprehended between the Tweed and Solway, " and the Scottiſh Friths, was more expoſed to " invaſion than Caledonia, we may conclude " that the Gael who poſſeſſed it were, in ſome " degree, mixed with the Cimbric Ottadini and " Brigantes, even before the invaſions of the " Romans preſſed thoſe tribes towards the North. " It was from this unavoidable mixture that the " Selgovæ, Gadeni, Damnii, and Novantes, were, " in an after-age, diſtinguiſhed by the name of " Mæatæ, which ſignifies a people deſcended " from a double origin, as well as the inhabitants " of a controverted country. (Moi-atta, or Moi- " atich, the inhabitants of the Plains: Mæan- " atta, the poſſeſſors of the Middle country [1]: " Moai-atta, a mixed people)."

The errors in this part of the Diſſertation ſeem to riſe before us every ſtep that we take, and are perpetually ſtopping us in our progreſs. This paſſage immediately follows the former.

[1] Theſe two etymons are given by Dr. Macpherſon, p. 23.

The former was the laſt of four or five ſucceſſive Extracts. And this is as pregnant with miſtakes as any of them.

If the mixture of Mr. Macpherſon's Ottadini and Brigantes with his Gael betwixt the Walls, was, as Mr. Macpherſon alledges, *unavoidable*, becauſe the country betwixt the Walls was the frontier of Caledonia; the ſame mixture muſt have been equally unavoidable, on the frontiers of the Belgæ and the Cimbri in Wales and in Maxima. The region betwixt the Solway, the Tweed, and the Friths, is not more "expoſed "to invaſion," than the land behind the Severne and the Dee, or the tract betwixt the Humber, the Merſey, the Tweed, and the Eden. And ſince the country to the South of the Solway and the Tweed muſt have been equally expoſed to invaſion, as the country to the North of them, the barriers of both being exactly the ſame; the ſame *unavoidable* mixture muſt have equally enſued in Northumberland as in the Lothians &c., and in Cumberland as in Anandale &c. The reaſoning therefore is not only inaccurate, but carries an edge with it, that, "like "an ill-ſheathed knife, will cut its maſter[1]."

The facts alſo and the etymons are both equally untrue.—I have previouſly ſhewn the Ottadini not to have been Cimbric, even upon Mr. Mac-

[1] Shakeſpear.

pherſon's

pherſon's own argument. And the invaſion of the Romans preſſed no tribes towards the North. All appear to have poſſeſſed exactly the ſame diviſions of the country before the Romans came, as they enjoyed afterwards. And this is particularly the caſe with reſpect to the Brigantes. They had reduced the Selgovæ before [1]. But the Gadeni, the Novantes, and the Damnii were totally unmixed either with Ottadini or Brigantes. And this *unavoidable* mixture is falſe in fact.—The name of Mæatæ, alſo, belonged not to any tribes betwixt the Walls, but to ſome that lay to the North of the more northerly Wall. This indeed has been conſiderably doubted. But it may be eaſily proved. In the Hiſtory of Manchéſter I have already ſhewn, to the fulleſt conviction, I believe, of every mind, that the Romans retained the province betwixt the Walls regularly in their own poſſeſſion, from the period of its firſt conqueſt to the æra of their departure from the iſland [2]. And the expedition of the Emperor Severus was, therefore, againſt the Britons that lay to the North of Antoninus's Vallum. The Mæatæ then whom he reduced, who afterwards revolted, and to whom Caracalla reſigned up all the conqueſts of his Father, muſt have been ſome tribes to the North of that

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 104.
[2] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 453. 458.

Vallum.—And thus wrong in the poſition of the Mæatæ, Mr. Macpherſon is ſure to be wrong in his explanation of their name. And it is neither juſt in its own nature, nor right in its application to them. It it not juſt, becauſe in the Text it equally gives two, and, ſtill more ſtrangely, in the Note equally annexes three, very different imports to the word; the inhabitants of the Plains; the poſſeſſors of a middle country, or (as to humour his Hypotheſis, he contradictorily calls it in the Text) a controverted one; and a mixed people. All three were certainly not meant by the name. And, of the two mentioned in the Text, neither was meant at all. This is obvious from the impropriety of deducing Mæatæ from Moai-atich, and the greater impropriety of deducing it from Mæan-atich. And even the derivation of it from Moi-atich, which is the beſt of them all, and had been previouſly adopted in the Hiſtory of Manchester [1], appears to me now to be harſh and forced. How Mr. Macpherſon could be induced to give this interpretation in the Note, I cannot conceive; as it plainly ſtands in direct oppoſition to the reaſonings and etymons in the Text. And the real etymology of the name, I believe, is this. Mag, a Plain, muſt have been equally pronounced May and Mæ originally, as

[1] P. 415.

it

it naturally would be, and as it is now written Mæs in Welſh and Moi in Iriſh. And the inhabitants of the lower lands of Caledonia, which lie immediately to the North of Antoninus's Vallum, and along the line of the Eaſtern coaſt, would naturally be diſtinguiſhed from the reſt of the Caledonians, the Mountaineers upon one ſide of them, by ſome topical and deſcriptive appellation. The Mountaineers are thus diſcriminated at preſent by the title of Albanech or Highlanders. And the others are to this day frequently denominated the Lowlanders. May or Mæ, a Plain, runs out into Mai-ed or Mæ-at in the plural. And as we have ſeen Fir-Gallt and Fir-Caledon above, and as the Carnabii and Cantii muſt have been originally Fir-Cant and Fir-Carnab, ſo Mæatæ muſt have been Fir-Mæ-at, and ſignifies the Men of the Plains.

I have dwelt the longer upon this paſſage, to lay open the inaccurate mode of reaſoning which is uſed by Mr. Macpherſon, the very bold manner in which he advances ſuppoſitions into certainty, and his ſtrange method of contradicting in the Notes what he aſſerts in the Text. The reaſoning here is peculiarly looſe and flimſy. The aſſertions are uncommonly ſtrong and arbitrary. And the contradiction of the Note to the Text is remarkably ſtriking.

P. 54.

P. 54. Our author, having in p. 52, 53 ſatisfactorily proved from the Greek and Roman writers, that the antient Iriſh were the deſcendants of the Britons, ſays thus — "The name of Gael, ſtill "retained by the old Iriſh, ſufficiently demon- "ſtrates that they derive their blood from thoſe "Gael or Gauls, who, in an after period, were "diſtinguiſhed in Britain by the name of Cale- "donians. The wildeſt enthuſiaſts in Hibernian "antiquities never once aſſerted that the Cale- "donians, or their poſterity the Picts, were of "Iriſh extract; yet nothing is better aſcertained "than that the antient Britons of the South gave "to the Scots, the Picts, and the Iriſh, the com- "mon name of Gael; and conſequently that they "very juſtly concluded that the three nations "derived their origin from the ſame ſource, the "antient Gael of the continent."

This *demonſtration* is no argument at all. This will immediately appear. And a very ſlight examination will add one more proof to the many that we have had before, of Mr. Macpherſon's unhappineſs in the work of proving.

The Iriſh are ſaid, by retaining the name of Gael, to prove themſelves the deſcendants of the Caledonians. If the author here includes the country to the South of the Friths in the name of Caledonia, then he is once more in a ſtate of hoſtility

hoſtility with ſome of his former poſitions and with all hiſtory. If he does not, then the Iriſh may be deſcended from the Gael of Galloway. And, whether he does or not, his reaſoning from the name of Gael is quite impertinent. The name is no evidence at all of the Caledonian deſcent of the Iriſh. It was not appropriated to the Caledonians either North or South of the Friths. It was, as I have previouſly ſhewn, common to all the Britons, deduced with them from Gaul, and retained by them in all their iſlands. And the Iriſh might be equally *demonſtrated* to be derived from the Gael of Wales, the Gael of Cornwall, or the Gael of Kent and Suſſex.

The antient Britons of the South are alſo ſaid to have given the name of Gael to the Scots, the Picts, and the Iriſh, and "conſequently to have "very juſtly concluded" them to be all one and the ſame people. This concluſion, however, is not the antient Britons, but Mr. Macpherſon's. And it is not juſt at all. Though the antient Britons of the South did call the Scots, the Picts, and the Iriſh, by the common name of Gael, they did not mean to derive the firſt and the laſt from the ſecond. They equally gave the name of Gael to themſelves, as I have ſhewed before, to the tribes of Kent and Suſſex, to the nations of Cornwall and Wales, and to all the Britons.

But the courſe of the author's reaſoning here is very remarkable. He produces an argument

to

to prove, that the Iriſh were derived from the Caledonians. And at the cloſe of it he concludes, that the Iriſh were derived — from the native Gauls. The name of Gael demonſtrates the Iriſh to " derive their blood from *thoſe Gael or Gauls*, " *who, in an after period, were diſtinguiſhed by* " *the name of Caledonians.*" And the name of Gael proves the Scots, the Picts, and the Iriſh to have " derived their origin from the ſame ſource, " *the antient Gael of the continent.*" Vainly imagining, in oppoſition to the moſt obvious evidences, that the name of Gael in Britain was appropriated entirely to the Caledonians; and wildly ſuppoſing, in contradiction to the moſt expreſs declarations of hiſtory, that the other tribes of Britain were German-Celtic; Mr. Macpherſon goes on with a falſe aſſociation of ideas from the beginning to the cloſe of his work, walking in one circle of errors, and plunging into abſurdities and contradictions at every turn.

P. 54. a note. " Mr. O'Connor, who lately " gave to the public ſome wild, incoherent " tales, concerning the antient Iriſh, endea- " vours to obviate the ſtrength of the argu- " ment, which riſes againſt his ſyſtem from the " name of Gael, by diſguiſing the word by the " inſertion of the intermediate letters, DH, as thus, " *Gadhel.*

" *Gadhel.* The ſubterfuge avails nothing. DH " are univerſally quieſcent, or at moſt ſound " like a Y, in every dialect of the Celtic lan- " guage."

The argument deduced from Gael may be effectual againſt Mr. O'Connor's ſyſtem, but, as I have already ſhewn, is of no force to eſtabliſh Mr. Macpherſon's. The indigenous appellation of Gael for the Iriſh ſerves ſtrongly to evince them, what hiſtory demonſtrates them to be, the deſcendants of the Britons. But it ſerves not in the leaſt to point out the particular diviſion of Britain, from which they were immediately derived.

Mr. Macpherſon's intimate acquaintance with the Celtic language, was ſuch an advantage over the body of our hiſtorical writers, that he might very juſtly, as he does in p. 5 and 38, plume himſelf conſiderably upon it. But I have previouſly remarked, that his knowledge of the Celtic appeared to be confined within the pale of a ſingle dialect. And the preſent Extract confirms me in the opinion. Mr. Macpherſon in p. 46 commends the author of the Critical Diſſertations, for his " great knowledge *of all the* " *branches* of the Celtic language." The knowledge of both, however, ſeems to me to have been confined almoſt entirely to the Iriſh or Erſe. It particularly ſeems ſo here. Mr. Macpherſon could not otherwiſe have imagined, as he here

aſſerts,

afferts, that DH are "univerſally quieſcent, or "at moſt ſound like a Y, *in every dialect* of the "Celtic." And he re-afferts it in p. 148, ſaying that "Gaidhel, — as the DH are *invariably* "quieſcent in Celtic words, is much the ſame "with Gael." This is very true concerning the Iriſh. But it is utterly untrue with regard to the Welſh particularly. This is a principal dialect of the Celtic. And the Welſh Guidhil, the ſame with the Iriſh Gaidhel, which Dr. Macpherſon expreſsly afferts to be pronounced like it, Gael[1], is not pronounced like it at all, but actually and fully Guidhil. — We have alſo an inſtance of the ſame nature in p. 130. There the Welſh appellation for Ireland, Ywerdhon or Yverdhon, is ſaid expreſsly to be "pronounced Yberon or "Yveron." And it is really pronounced, as it is written, Ywerdhon. — The author's and his friend's acquaintance with "every dialect of the "Celtic," did not extend to the Welſh. And his obſervation of the *invariable* quieſcence of the DH in Celtic, and his friend's remark on the pronunciation of the word Guidhil, were both drawn, we ſee, from a view of the Iriſh only.

[1] See p. 97.

P. 54, 55.

P. 54, 55. "The Britiſh Gael, in an early age, "extending themſelves to the very extremities "of the iſland, deſcried Ireland from the Mulls "of Galloway and Cantire, and croſſing the nar- "row channel which ſeparates the two countries, "became the progenitors of the Iriſh nation. In "proportion as freſh emigrants from the conti- "nent of Europe forced the antient Gael towards "the North in Britain, more colonies tranſmi- "grated into Ireland from the promontories which "we have ſo often mentioned."

The great hiſtorians of antiquity have claimed the privilege of being believed upon their own authority, and without any regular reference to the older chronicles. But the privilege is confined to them. Every modern hiſtorian that writes of a period preceding his own, of which he muſt know the incidents merely by tradition from others, is juſtly required to authenticate his accounts as he proceeds, and to produce ſufficient vouchers for his facts. And the hiſtorical writer, that neglects this duty, muſt be content to ſee his work, perhaps, the favourite hiſtory of an hour, pleaſing by its novelty, and engaging by its elegance, and then to have it reſigned up to neglect and contempt for ever. — Here is the original inhabitation of Ireland by the Gael of Caledonia aſſerted, the place aſſigned from which the

the original colony embarked, and the migration of additional colonies from the ſame place, in conſequence of freſh invaſions of Britain, affirmed; and all, without one article of authority, or one note of diffidence.

P. 55. "The Gael — became ſo numerous "in that country [Ireland] before the arrival of "the Belgæ in Britain, that the colonies which "tranſmigrated from that nation into Ireland "were, together with their language, manners, "and cuſtoms, loſt in the Gael; ſo that in one "ſenſe the Caledonians may be reckoned the "ſole progenitors of the old Iriſh. (The Fir-Bolg, "ſo often mentioned in the traditions of the "Iriſh, were Belgic colonies who tranſmigrated "from Britain after the Belgæ had ſeized on the "ſouthern diviſion of England. They are men-"tioned very frequently under the name of Siol "na m Bolga in the poems of Oſſian."

The Gael are here ſaid to have been "ſo nu-"merous in Ireland before the arrival of the "Belgæ in Britain," that, when the Belgæ came into Ireland, they were loſt in the Gael. How very inconcluſive! The Belgæ, when they came into Ireland, were loſt in the Gael: and therefore the Gael, it is argued, muſt have been

very numerous in Ireland, before the Belgæ arrived — in Britain. How ſtrangely inaccurate!

That the Belgæ were loſt in the Gael of Ireland, is a fact which is equally aſſerted and denied by Mr. Macpherſon in the preſent Extract. It is expreſsly aſſerted in the Text, and plainly denied in the Note. And I have ſhewn an inſtance of the ſame nature immediately before. The Belgæ, according to Mr. Macpherſon's own account in the Note, muſt have ſurvived for ages diſtinct from the Gael; or elſe no "traditions of "the Iriſh" could exiſt concerning them at preſent. The Belgæ, according to the ſame account in Mr. Macpherſon, muſt have ſurvived to the third century at leaſt, not only diſtinct from, but even oppoſed to, the Gael; or they would not have been mentioned ſo frequently, under their own name of Belgæ, in the Poems of Oſſian. And they accordingly appear in Mr. Macpherſon's own Temora, waging long and bloody wars with the Gael.

That the Belgæ were loſt in the Gael at all, is inferred evidently from the Iriſh, the Belgic and the Caelic Iriſh, equally calling themſelves, and being called by others, the Gael. But the inference is groſsly unjuſt. I have already ſhewn all the Belgæ of Britain to have been actually denominated Gael. And the Belgic language appears deciſively to have been the Gallic or Bri-

tiſh. This is plain from the only remains that we have of the Belgic, the names of their tribes, their towns, their woods, and their rivers, and the exact correſpondency of all to the names of the Britiſh. Thus we have Iſca, the name of a river among the Belgæ of Devonſhire and the Britons of Wales; Alauna, for a river in Hampſhire, Warwicſhire, and Lancaſhire; and a Sturius in Kent and between Norfolk and Suffolk: the town of Camulodunum among the Belgæ of Eſſex and the Britons of Yorkſhire; Durobrovis in Kent, and Durocobrivis in Northamptonſhire; Venta in Hampſhire, Norfolk, and Monmouthſhire; and Vectis in Hampſhire, and Vect-urion-es in Scotland: a Caledonian Wood in Kent and Suſſex, in Lincolnſhire and ſome adjoining counties, and in the Highlands of Scotland: the Damnonii of Devonſhire and Valentia; the Cantæ of Caledonia, and the Cantii of Kent; and the Novantes of Middleſex and Galloway.

The whole of this paſſage is obviouſly compoſed, in order to give the Caledonians the honour of being the anceſtors of the Iriſh. For this, hiſtory and reaſon are diſtorted. For this, Mr. Macpherſon is at war with himſelf. And, for this, even Oſſian is contradicted. But, even if the fact was as Mr. Macpherſon ſtates it to have been, the end and deſign, poor and trifling as it is, could not be anſwered. Even though the Belgæ had been loſt in the Gael, and even though the

Gael had been Caledonians, the Caledonians could in no ſenſe be reckoned the *ſole* progenitors of the old Iriſh. The Iriſh muſt even then be derived from a mixt race of Britons; and the Belgæ of South-Britain muſt have concurred with the Gael of the North, to claim the honour of producing them. Though the Belgæ had been covered with the name of Gael, they would not leſs have been Belgæ, or have leſs contributed to produce the Iriſh.

P. 55—57. " When the Gael arrived firſt in " Ireland they naturally gave it the name of Iar- " in, or the weſtern country —. From Iar-in is " not only to be deduced the Eirin of the Iriſh " themſelves, but thoſe various names by which " the Greeks and Romans diſtinguiſhed their " iſland (Juverna, Ierna, Iris, Ουϊρνια, Hibernia). " —Hibernia, the moſt common name by which " the Romans diſtinguiſhed Ireland, may appear " to ſome too remote in the pronunciation and " orthography from Iar-in, or H'Eirin [*the* " Weſtern Country], to be derived from either. " This difficulty is eaſily removed. Julius Cæſar " mentions, for the firſt time, Ireland under the " name of Hibernia. One of two reaſons in- " duced the illuſtrious writer to uſe that appel- " lation. He either latinized the H'Yverdhon of

" the Southern Britains, or, what is more proba-
" ble, he annexed to Ireland a name which ſuited
" his own ideas of its air and climate,—and—
" formed the name of Hibernia from the adjec-
" tive Hibernus."

I have cited this paſſage, principally to mark the ſtrange manner in which, within a few lines, the author palpably contradicts himſelf. And I have produced more than one inſtance of this before.—In the beginning of the Extract, Hibernia is without heſitation pronounced to be derived from the Caledonian Iar-in. But, in the concluſion, it is declared to be derived either from the Welſh H'Yverdhon or the Latin Hibernus. Thus is Mr. Macpherſon his own greateſt adverſary. And while, in the gaiety of indiſcretion, he is brandiſhing his ſword to hew down all oppoſition, he unhappily buries it in his own boſom.

The deduction of Hibernia from the Latin Hibernus is one of the meaneſt and moſt frivolous etymons, among the thouſands which have diſgraced the ſcience of etymology, that I ever remember to have ſeen of late. It is only fit for that infantine period of human learning and human underſtanding, which originally gave it to the world, and which exhauſted all its feeble powers in the derivation of Scotland from the Greek Σκότος, and of Albion and Hibernia from the Latin Hibernus and Albus. And I am aſtoniſhed

that

that a gentleman, of Mr. Macpherſon's ſpirit and intellect, could ever ſtoop to raiſe ſuch an etymon from its peaceful grave in the duſt.

The names of Iris, Ierna, Juverna, and Hibernia are all obviouſly deduced from the ſame radical word. Iar or Eir, Weſt, evidently forms the Ir in Iris and the Ier in Ierna. And Ier being ſometimes pronounced Iver and Hiber, as Cumri and Cimmerii were changed into Cumbri and Cimbri, and as Eure, the name of a river in France and in England, was formed into Ebur in Ebur-acum and Eburo-vices; with the addition of In, an iſland, it plainly compoſes Ier-ina, Ierna, Iver-na, and Hiber-nia.

I HAVE here given the reader a full and compleat view of Mr. Macpherſon's conjectures and arguments, concerning the firſt population of Ireland by the Caledonians. And the whole reſolves itſelf into two points, That Ireland would naturally be firſt peopled from the Mulls of Galloway and Cantire; and, That the indigenous name of Gael for the Iriſh is a proof of their Caledonian deſcent. The former obviouſly

amounts only to a fair probability. And the latter has not even that merit. The argument has been repeatedly overthrown, by ſhewing the appellation of Gael not to have been confined to the Caledonians, but to have extended with the colonies of the Britons over all their iſlands. And even the probability, fair as it is, can be of no ſervice to Mr. Macpherſon, ſince Galloway is not within the limits of Caledonia, and ſince the probability is equally favourable to Galloway as to Cantire.

In the Hiſtory of Mancheſter I have ſhewn from indiſputable authorities, when and by whom the iſle of Ireland was firſt inhabited. About 350 years before Chriſt, the Belgæ croſſed the Channel into Britain, and ſeized the whole extended line of the ſouthern coaſt from Kent into Devonſhire. Numbers of the former inhabitants, that had gradually retired before the enemy, were obliged at laſt to take ſhipping upon our weſtern coaſt, and paſſed over into the uninhabited iſle of Ireland. And theſe were afterwards joined by another body of Britons, at the great attack upon the neighbouring ſtates by the Belgæ under Divitiacus, who purſued the track of their brethren, and aſſociated with them in Ireland. The firſt population of that fine iſland, therefore, was originally begun, not by the northern, but by the ſouthern, Britons; not from

the

the promontories of Caledonia, but from the ſhores of the Channel; in conſequence of the Belgic invaſion of Britain, and about the year 350 before the Chriſtian æra. And this, the firſt colony that came into Ireland, was ſucceeded by another, which was as little deduced from the northern Britons or the hills of Caledonia, and came equally from the ſhores of the ſouthern ſea, in conſequence of the advances of the Belgæ into the interiors of Britain, and about the year 100 before Chriſt [1].

I have alſo ſhewn from the ſame indiſputable authorities, that Ireland, for two centuries and a half afterwards, was continually recruited with freſh colonies from Britain; as the populouſneſs of this iſland, and the vicinity of that, invited them to ſettle in the one, or as the bloody and ſucceſſive wars in Britain, during this period, naturally induced them to relinquiſh the other. The third and fourth colonies that ſettled in Ireland, as I have obſerved in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter, were in all probability derived from Galloway and Cantire. As the Epidii and Damnii of thoſe countries lay the neareſt of any Britons to the iſle of Ireland, they muſt therefore be ſuppoſed, after the extraordinary embarkations of their ſouthern brethren, to have been the

[1] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 432, 433.

firſt of all the Britons that planted colonies within it. And the name of Damnii, for a tribe on the oppoſite ſhores of Ireland and Britain, gives a great additional weight to the ſuppoſition. Theſe ſettlements were moſt probably occaſioned by the mere populouſneſs of Britain, crouded as it now began to be with inhabitants, and by the mere proximity of Ireland, plain as it appeared to the eye from the ſhores of Cantire and Galloway. But the ſucceeding colonies were occaſioned by the wars of the Britons among themſelves, and of the Romans againſt them all. And I have endeavoured, and with no little ſucceſs, I think, to trace back every new colony to its original diſtrict in Britain, and to refer their paſſage into Ireland to the very commotion that ſent them thither. The iſland appears to have been planted with colonies from the whole range of our weſtern coaſt. The Belgæ of Dorſetſhire and Cornwall at one end, the Britons of Caledonia at the other, and almoſt every nation betwixt them, all contributed to the population of Ireland. And the whole circuit of the country was compleatly peopled about 150 years after Chriſt. Some hiſtorical notices, that have never been made uſe of before, have lent the general light that has directed me in this diſcovery. The occurrence of the ſame names of tribes and of towns, in both iſlands, has led me on. One or

two

two intimations and ſome hiſtorical facts, in the Poems of Oſſian, have furniſhed additional evidence. And from the whole I have been enabled to draw up the firſt authentic hiſtory of Ireland, as to the primary population of the iſle, and the original tranſactions of the coloniſts, that has hitherto made its appearance in any language [1].

[1] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 434—438.

CHAP.

CHAP. III.

WE are now come to that important period of Mr. Macpherſon's Introduction, for which all the reſt was evidently written, for which we have ſeen all the annals of the iſland and the continent diſtorted from their true line, antient Hiſtory garbled and contradicted, and Mr. Macpherſon's own aſſertions mangled and oppoſed. We are now come to the Origin of the Scots.

I.

FROM p. 58 to 78 Mr. Macpherſon is engaged in a formal attack upon the pretenſions of the Iriſh, to an original very different from the other inhabitants of the Britiſh iſles, in order to prove them and the Scots the deſcendants of the Caledonians. The attack indeed is very eaſy. Thoſe fabricks of fiction, which the Iriſh credulity and patriotiſm have been rearing for ages, all melt away before the ſtrong beams of Hiſtory and Criticiſm. But the romances are replete with ſuch prodigies of fiction and folly, and are ſo univerſally deſpiſed by the judicious and the thinking both on the continent and in our own iſland, that they were not worthy of a ſerious refutation. And ſuch a writer as Mr. Macpherſon, engaged in ſuch a conteſt, ſeems to me like the redoubtable Sir John in Shakeſpear, attacking a dead man ſword in hand, and with one wound more in his thigh carrying him away in triumph [r].

[r] But it is proper to obſerve, that almoſt every argument in this diſquiſition is borrowed, ſometimes literally, and generally without acknowledgement, from Innes's Critical Eſſay. The reference to Strabo in p. 60 and 61 of Mr. Macpherſon; to Mela, Tacitus, and Solinus, in p. 62; the anſwers to objec-

Mr.

Mr. Macpherſon in p. 78—91 applies himſelf to the harder taſk of refuting the arguments of Father Innes, concerning the Spaniſh or the Scandinavian extraction of the Scots of Ireland. But theſe, and all the other concluſions of our Hiſtorians and Antiquarians, may be anſwered without any great difficulty. Fluttering for want of information concerning the real deſcent of the Scots, the hiſtorical mind has wandered over the continent in ſearch of their original home, has eagerly caught at the moſt trifling appearances of argument, has readily embraced the wildeſt ſuggeſtions of Tradition, and has molded both into a ſyſtem, which is more ſpecious and ſolid than the fictions of the Iriſh, but which eaſily yields to the preſſure of a well-directed blow. So far therefore as Mr. Macpherſon's arguments relate only to the Spaniſh or Scandinavian origin of the Scots, I ſhall not attend to them. Mr. Macpherſon may demoliſh thoſe Gothick Structures at his will. His efforts are ſpirited, and his labours deciſive. But when he endeavours, as he does

tions in p. 63; the appeal to Camden, Ware, and Uſher, in p. 64, 65; what is ſaid of Ware and the Pſalter-Caſhel in p. 67, and of the form of the Iriſh Alphabet in p. 67, 68; are all taken from Innes p. 428, 429, 431, and 432, 430, 433—434, 435—437, 434—435, 439, and 448—449, without one acknowledgement of the real Owner, and more than once with the adoption of his own words.—And Dr. Macpherſon had borrowed ſome of the arguments before from Innes. See p. 88—90.—Compare alſo p. 70, 71 of Mr. Macpherſon with p. 90 of Dr. Macpherſon.

twice,

twice, to derive any advantage from his conquests in favour of a Caledonian origin, I must then beg leave to interpose, and shew his pretensions to be as false as the Irish, and his arguments as visionary as Innes's.

P. 78, 79. At entering on his refutation, Mr. Macpherson speaks thus.—"They [the "Scots] came, says the ingenious Father [Innes], "either from Scandia or Cantabria [into Ire-"land], about the time of the Incarnation, or "rather a little time after it.—Innes is the only "writer who has reduced the origin of the Scots "into a regular system; and he endeavours to "defend it. Should the ingenious Father's "scheme be destroyed, the Caledonian extraction "of the Irish must of course rise upon its ruins."

This is surely a very extraordinary argument. Though the Irish be proved not to have been derived from Scandinavia or Cantabria, we are not one step nearer to their derivation from Caledonia. They may have come with equal probability from the whole extended shore of Britain, that reaches from Caledonia to the Channel. And I have already shewn that they actually did.

P. 90, 91. At the concluſion of his refutation, Mr. Macpherſon ſpeaks thus.—" We muſt " have recourſe, in the laſt reſort, to the Caledonian Britons for the genuine origin of the " Iriſh. Their name of Gael, their language, " the conformity of their manners and cuſtoms " with thoſe of the Old Britons, all concur in " proving, beyond any poſſibility of reply, that " the Iriſh are the poſterity of the Gauls or " Gael, who, after having traverſed the iſland " of Great Britain, paſſed over, in a very early " period, into Ireland from the promontories of " Galloway and Cantire."

All the arguments here hinted at have been urged before. And I ſhall not re-anſwer them here.—I have frequently remarked before Mr. Macpherſon's repeated inconſiſtency, in ſometimes extending his Caledonia on the ſouth to the Wall of Severus, and in ſometimes reducing it to the Friths of Forth and Clyde. And I have alſo obſerved, that, as the real Caledonia never included Galloway, no argument, for the paſſage of the firſt coloniſts into Ireland from Galloway, will evince the Caledonian deſcent of the Iriſh.—I have repeatedly ſhewn above, that the name of Gael cannot aſſiſt in proving the Iriſh to be the poſterity of the Caledonians. It will equally prove them to have been the poſterity of the Galloweſe, the Welſh, and the Corniſh, and of any tribe in any part of this iſland.—The correſpondency

reſpondency of language, manners, and cuſtoms, betwixt the Iriſh and Caledonians, is juſt as good an argument as the community of names before. The language, manners, and cuſtoms, of almoſt all the interior Iſlanders, have been ſhewn to be exactly the ſame.—But the author's management of his argument, with regard to the correſpondency of manners and cuſtoms, is a little obſervable. " We muſt have recourſe," ſays He, " to the *Caledonian Britons* for the genuine " origin of the Iriſh." And one argument is, " the conformity of their [the Iriſh] manners " and cuſtoms with thoſe"—,not of the Caledonian Britons, as it ſhould obviouſly have been, in contradiſtinction to all the others, but of " the Old Britons" in general. To prove the *Caledonian* deſcent of the Iriſh, Mr. Macpherſon alledges the ſameneſs of manners in the Iriſh and the Old Britons.—Theſe arguments therefore, which " all concur in proving beyond any poſ- " ſibility of reply," that the Iriſh are the poſterity of the Caledonians, are all really beſide the mark, and prove ſomething very different from the point intended.

So far I have conſidered this paſſage, as it contains a repetition of former arguments. I will now conſider it, as an inference from the reply to Father Innes. And, as ſuch, it is in the ſame ſtrain preciſely with the quotation before. Like that, it forgets an intermediate link in the chain

chain of reaſoning. What Mr. Macpherſon has ſaid, diſproves the Spaniſh and Scandinavian deſcent of the Iriſh. And ſo far it is uſeful. But it then contends for another, which is juſt as imaginary as the ſyſtem of the Fileas or the Hypotheſis of the Jeſuit. And, in the love of innovation and the prevalence of prejudice, Mr. Macpherſon has over-looked the obvious tendency of his own arguments, and ſubſtituted Caledonia for Britain.

P. 92. Mr. Macpherſon now proceeds regularly to overthrow the Iriſh deſcent of the Scots, and to eſtabliſh the Caledonian. And I ſhall attend him regularly in his progreſs.

P. 92. "The credit of the Mileſian tale is "already deſtroyed, and it is perhaps ſuper- "fluous to refute the pretended Hibernian ex- "traction of the Scots. Both ſtories depend "upon the ſame authority, and they muſt both "fall by the ſame argument."

This is certainly not true. The Mileſian ſtory concerning the firſt population of Ireland, and the account of the migration of the Scots from Ireland into Britain, are two incidents that are founded

founded upon very different authorities. The former reſts ſolely upon the credit of writers that never exiſted, and upon the authority of records that were written ſome ages before the uſe of Letters was known in the iſland. The latter is grounded upon the authority of writers actually or nearly cotemporary with the facts, upon hiſtories of the beſt credit, and upon records of the greateſt authenticity, Bede, Oroſius, and others. And this our author ſufficiently acknowledges hereafter. In p. 110 he ſays, that "the abet-"tors of the Hibernian Antiquities, finding that "the credit of the domeſtic annals of Ireland "could never eſtabliſh this fact, had recourſe "to ſome paſſages of foreign writers." The Hibernian extraction of the Scots therefore, according to Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, does not "depend upon the ſame authority" with the Mileſian tale, and muſt not "fall by the ſame "argument." It is fixed, according to Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, upon the additional teſtimonies "of foreign writers;" and it muſt be overthrown by a reply to thoſe teſtimonies. And Mr. Macpherſon accordingly cites the authority of Claudian, Oroſius, Iſidore, and Bede for it, in p. 105, 111, 116, &c., and ſpends various pages in replying to them. So little does the author ſeem to have had a full view of his plan, as he proceeded in the work. And ſo little does he ſeem

to have looked back upon the parts, when he had compleated the whole.

P. 93. " It has already appeared that nothing " certain is known concerning the affairs of " Ireland, prior to the miſſion of St. Patrick."

This is a reference to the preceding parts of the work. And, what is very extraordinary, it is directly contradictory to them.—We are here told, that nothing certain is known concerning the affairs of Ireland before the days of St. Patrick. And yet in p. 80 Mr. Macpherſon himſelf argues from Diodorus, that the Iriſh were Britons; in p. 81 (and again in p. 95) from Tacitus, that in the days of Agricola the Iriſh were ſo weak, as to be deemed a ready conqueſt to a Legion and a competent number of Auxiliaries; in p. 82 from Ptolemy, that the Velaborii, Brigantes, Caucii, and Menapii were ſome of the tribes of Ireland; in p. 60, 61, 62, and 63, from Strabo, Diodorus, Mela, and Solinus, that the Iriſh were then rude and uncivilized; and in p. 63 (and again in p. 95) from Tacitus, that in his time the Iriſh ports were even more frequented by the merchants, and were therefore better known to the world, than the Britiſh.

It

It gives me pain to remark the groſs and repeated contradictions in ſo ingenious a writer. I ſtrain, I exaggerate, nothing. I only collate parts with parts. And the inconſiſtency, that appears upon the face of theſe collations, muſt be attributed, ſometimes to Mr. Macpherſon's ſervility to the intereſts of an Hypotheſis, and ſometimes to the haſtineſs and inattention with which Mr. Macpherſon appears to have written his work.

II.

THE author, now ſetting himſelf to prove, that no Iriſh colony tranſmigrated into Britain in or after the reign of Domitian, takes a review of what the Romans have communicated to us concerning the ſtate of Caledonia, from that period to the appearance of the Scots on the frontiers of the province. With this review I am but partially concerned. Till it deſcends to the 4th century, it has no relation to that migration of the Scots into Ireland, which alone

is asserted in the History of Manchester and I wish to defend. And I shall therefore, in pursuing Mr. Macpherson's steps here, only mark occasionally some of the more important mistakes, till he has deduced the history to the proper period.

P. 99. "The incursions of the Caledonians "rendered it necessary for that Emperor [Ad-"rian] to come in person into Britain; but that "the Barbarians suffered very little loss by his "arms we may naturally infer, from his relin-"quishing to them all that tract of country which "extends from the Tine and Solway to the "Scottish Friths."

That the incursions of the Caledonians rendered it necessary for Adrian to come into Britain, is not true. And that he relinquished all the country from the Tine and the Solway to the Friths, is a mistake.—Adrian went into all the provinces of the Empire. Romanum orbem circuivit, says Florus with an expressive elegance. Was this occasioned by the Caledonian incursions? He only visited Britain, as he visited Gaul and the other dominions of the Romans.—Nor did he relinquish Valentia to the Caledonians, by building a Wall from Solway to the Tine. This I have fully shewn in the History of

of Manchester. And all the region of Valentia remained in the possession of the Romans, to the period of their departure from Britain [1].

P. 100. "Lollius Urbicus, in the reign of "Antoninus Pius, defeated the Caledonians; and, "driving them beyond the Forth and Clyde, "excluded them by an earthen Wall from the "Roman Britain. Though repelled by Urbi-"cus,—they were far from being reduced so low "as to yield a part of their territories to the Ro-"mans."

This is a great mistake. The Brigantes, or Caledonians, are expressly said by Pausanias to have lost a considerable tract of country, τὴν πολλὴν, to the Romans at this period. And I have fully shewn in the History of Manchester, that this consisted of half the region of Caledonia [2].

P. 101, 102. "Severus — marched north-"ward, with a fixed resolution to exterminate the "whole nation of the Caledonians. But—he "was at last reduced to the old and inglorious "expedient of building a Wall to exclude from

[1] History of Manchester, p. 453—458.

[2] P. 454—461, and 418, 419.

" the Province thoſe Barbarians whom he could
" neither extirpate or ſubdue. (Ες φιλιαν επαγηλ-
" θεν, ες ομολογιαν τες Βρετ]ανες επι τω χωρας ȣκ
" ολιγης εκ]ηναι, αναγκασας ελθειν. Dion. Caſſ.
" lib. 76)."

This is in general a very unfair repreſentation of the principles and ſucceſs of Severus's expedition. And it will eaſily appear, even from Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, to be unfair.—It is here expreſsly declared, that Severus could not ſubdue any of the Caledonians. And it is here plainly implied, that he relinquiſhed to them all the country to the North of his Wall. " He
" was—reduced to the *old* and *inglorious* expe-
" dient of building a Wall to exclude from *the*
" *Province* thoſe Barbarians whom he could nei-
" ther extirpate or *ſubdue*." But Severus actually ſubdued all the tribes of the Mæatæ, and pretty certainly recovered all the conqueſts of Lollius[1]. And the very quotation, which Mr. Macpherſon adduces in proof of his own poſition, expreſsly declares the contrary. The quotation ſays poſitively, that Severus forced the Caledonians to reſign up no ſmall portion of their country to him, χωρας ȣκ ολιγης εκ]ηναι. And this concurs with many inſtances before to ſhew us, how little dependence we can have upon Mr. Macpherſon's authorities, even when

[1] See Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 419.

he

he recites them fairly at the foot of the page, and when he has no ſtrong bias to miſlead his hand as he copies.—Nor did Severus relinquiſh Valentia to the Caledonians. When he was advancing with a reſolution to reduce all Caledonia, or when he was juſt returning from the actual reduction of half the country, he could not poſſibly have been either compelled or invited to reſign up Valentia to the enemy. And Valentia remained one of the 5 Provinces of Roman Britain, to the final period of the Roman dominion in the iſland [1].—Nor was the reſolution to exterminate the Caledonians taken up by Severus, before he made his expedition into their country. It was taken up afterwards, when the ſubjected tribes of Caledonia had thrown off their obedience, and were inſtantly joined by the reſt of the Caledonians. Severus's reſentment kindled at the news. He ordered the army immediately, and in the depth of winter, to march to the North under the command of Caracalla, to relieve the garriſons in the ſtations [2], which muſt have been cloſely beſieged, and to ſpread an univerſal carnage through the country. And Mr. Macpherſon has attributed a deſign to the firſt expedition, which was only an order for the ſecond [3].

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 454. [2] Dio, p. 1287, τὰ φρέρια. [3] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 419, 420.

P. 94—104. In theſe pages is contained the firſt great argument, " to prove that no Iriſh " colony tranſmigrated into Britain in or after " the reign of Domitian" (p. 94). And in p. " 103, 104. we are told thus.—" In the long " period which intervened between the acceſſion of " the ſons of Severus to the Imperial dignity, and " the middle of the 4th age,—the frequent conteſts " for the purple,—the public diſtractions which " aroſe naturally from theſe diſputes, the growing " imbecillity of the Empire, and the invaſions of " the Barbarians of the northern Europe, di- " verted the attention of the Romans from Ca- " ledonia. In a period ſo long, and of ſuch " tranquillity, the inhabitants of North Britain, " inſtead of declining, muſt have greatly multi- " plied their numbers. In the tenth Conſulſhip " of Conſtantius, the ſon of Conſtantine, we " meet with the Scots, a formidable Nation in " Britain. Ammianus Marcellinus, who found " them firſt in the iſland, does not furniſh one ob- " ſcure hint that they derived their blood from a " foreign country."

This long argument is intended to prove two points; That, in all this period of time, from the reign of Domitian to the middle of the fourth age, the Caledonians were never reduced ſo much

much, as to have any part of their country rent from them by a colony from Ireland; and, That, when the Scots are firſt mentioned as in the iſland by Marcellinus, he does not hint that they derived their deſcent from a foreign country. This is the full ſum and ſubſtance of the argument. And it is evidently unſatisfactory. To prove that no colony *tranſmigrated* from Ireland into Britain, he endeavours to ſhew, that no Iriſh colony *ſettled* in Britain by *violence*. To *prove* that the Scots did not come into Britain from Ireland, he ſhews that the hiſtorian, who firſt mentions them in Britain, does not ſay that they came from Ireland. The former is a mere fallacy, the ſubſtitution of one term for another. And the latter is merely a negative argument, ſtrangely adduced in ſupport of a poſitive aſſertion.

To this clear and ſhort refutation of Mr. Macpherſon's great argument, it is proper to add one obſervation concerning the alledged ſilence of Marcellinus. He who firſt found the Scots in this iſland, it is ſaid, "does not furniſh one ob-" ſcure hint that they derived their blood from " a foreign country." But Mr. Macpherſon is not aware, that the part of Marcellinus's hiſtory, which firſt noticed the Scots as in Britain, has been long loſt to the world. The appearance of the Scots "in the tenth conſulſhip of Conſtan-" tius," is not the firſt that they made in the Hiſtory

Hiſtory of Marcellinus. They made one twenty years before it, and in that portion of the hiſtory which has been unhappily deſtroyed. Conſulatu — Conſtantii decies, terque Juliani, in Britanniis cum *Scotorum* Pictorumque, gentium ferarum, excurſus, ruptâ quiete *condictâ*, loca limitibus vicina vaſtarent, et implicaret formido Provincias *præteritarum cladium* congerie *feſſas*; hiemem agens apud Pariſios, Cæſar — verebatur *ire ſubſidio tranſmarinis*, ut *retulimus ante feciſſe Conſtantem* [1]. Here we are informed, that the Scots and Picts had recently ravaged the country before 360, that Conſtans had paſſed over to repel them, and that Marcellinus had given an account of both theſe incidents. And Marcellinus appears to have taken occaſion from that incurſion into the province, to have expatiated in a long and laboured deſcription of the country that was then invaded, and to have given a particular account of the Scots and Picts that invaded it. Quoniam, ſays he himſelf, cùm Conſtantis Principis acta componerem, motus adoleſcentis & ſeneſcentis oceani, ſitumque Britanniæ, pro captu virium explanavi, ad ea quæ digeſta ſunt ſemel, revolvi ſuperfluum duxi —: illud tamen ſufficiet dici, quod eo tempore Picti—itidemque Attacotti —, et Scotti, per diverſa vagantes multa populabantur [2]. And therefore for

[1] L. xx. c. 1. [2] L. xxvii. c. 8.

Mr.

Mr. Macpherſon to affirm, that Marcellinus, who firſt found the Scots in Britain, furniſhes not one obſcure hint of their derivation from a foreign country; is to miſtake the time when Marcellinus firſt finds them in the iſland, is to aſſert what is certainly not true, and is to adduce an argument in favour of the Caledonian extraction of the Scots, which is equally frivolous in its nature and falſe in its atteſtation.

III.

PAG. 105. "Bede is the firſt writer who "poſitively affirms that the Scots of Britain "derived their origin from thoſe of Ireland. "Whether they originally obtained from the "Picts the principality of — Argyle by force or "treaty, was a point which all his hiſtorical and "traditional knowledge did not enable the vene-"rable Anglo-Saxon to determine. The inca-"pacity of Bede, who lived ſo near the pre-

"tended

" tended tranſmigration of the Iriſh, to ſolve this " difficulty, is a kind of demonſtration that the " whole ſtory is a fiction, impoſed upon that cre- " dulous, though pious writer."

This is ſurely ſuch an argument as was never produced before againſt a reſpectable hiſtorian. And it would ſurely be of no avail at all, even againſt the moſt irreſpectable that ever diſgraced the file of hiſtorical writers.—Bede's unacquaintedneſs with the reaſons and principles of a great tranſaction, can never annihilate his credit with regard to the fact itſelf. Such a great national tranſaction, as the firſt ſettlement of a body of Iriſh Scots on the coaſt of Caledonia, is an incident equally notorious and remarkable, that is not only obvious to all that are within the ſphere of obſervation, but calls and compels the attention of all the nations immediately about. The reaſon of the fact, however, lies much deeper, and is generally known only to the more informed and more inquiſitive part of the obſervers. The one therefore is naturally recorded by many writers. But the other is given only by ſuch, as look beyond the ſurface of the incident, and ſearch for the ſprings that operated to produce it. And even hiſtorians that are cotemporary with a fact, and that even endeavour to aſſign the reaſon and principle of it, are frequently unable, for want of proper information, to aſcertain the true one; and different writers attribute

attribute the ſame incident to different cauſes. From ſome of the many, Bede and Richard tranſcribed the account which they have given us; and the latter, as I have already ſhewn in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter, happily met with the year of the deed preciſely aſcertained [1]. But neither of them found any hiſtorian, that had inveſtigated the actuating motive and principle of it. That is left to the conjectural criticiſms of later writers. And in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter I have gueſſed at a motive, which has ſeveral coincidences of reaſon and hiſtory in its favour, and is therefore in all probability the true and genuine principle [2].

P. 105, 106. "If the Picts were ſo feeble that "a band of Iriſh adventurers could tear from "them one third of their dominions, how came "they ſo frequently to provoke the Roman le-"gions, and haraſs the provincials from the "time of Chlorus to the total dereliction of Bri-"tain by Honorius? To invade the territories "of a warlike and diſciplined people when they "ſuffered a great part of their own to be wreſted "from them by a deſpicable enemy, is a folly

[1] P. 446. [2] P. 447.

"too

" too abſurd to gain any credit. But perhaps " the Picts gave the diſtrict of Argyle to their " allies of Ireland, in conſideration of ſervices " againſt the Romans. Theſe ſervices were ex- " tremely unneceſſary; for the Romans, till pro- " voked by incurſions, were very inoffenſive to- " wards the Barbarians beyond the walls. Na- " tions, in ſhort, have been known to receive fo- " reigners into the boſom of their country to re- " pel invaſions, but it is ridiculous to think that " any people would have recourſe to ſo dange- " rous an expedient for the pleaſure of haraſſing " neighbours who did not in any degree offend " them."

The former was Mr. Macpherſon's firſt argument againſt Bede. This is his ſecond. And it is calculated to prove, that the Scots could not have ſettled in Caledonia, either by force or by treaty. But, ſuppoſing every part of the argument to be juſt, the whole is of no moment at all againſt a fact, that is poſitively aſſerted by a credible authority. Such an argument would not deſtroy the ſlighteſt incident of the ſlighteſt hiſtory that ever was written. Though the Scots could not ſettle by force, as indeed I think that Mr. Macpherſon's reaſoning ſeems ſtrongly to evince, they might ſettle by treaty, for any reaſon that is aſſigned by Mr. Macpherſon. The ſervices of the Scots againſt the Romans might be unneceſſary: and yet the Caledonians might allow

allow them a portion of land in their country. To invite the Iriſh into the iſland, merely to attack the inoffenſive Romans, might be folly in the Caledonians; and yet they might do it. Mr. Macpherſon forgets, that he is arguing, not againſt the aſſigned reaſons of a fact, but againſt the exiſtence of the fact itſelf. Againſt the former his arguments would carry weight. But they carry none at all againſt the latter. There are alſo other modes of ſettling peaceably in a country, than what is here mentioned. And in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter I have ſuggeſted one very different from this, and in all probability the true one [r].

P. 106, 107. — It is difficult for the unpre- "judiced part of mankind to believe, that a "colony, ſufficient to occupy the weſtern high- "lands and iſles, could have wafted themſelves, "their wives, and children, at once, from Ireland "into the northern Britain, in Curraghs or "miſerable ſkiffs, whoſe hulls of wicker were "wrapped up in a cow's hide. In theſe wretch- "ed veſſels, it is true, an irregular communi- "cation was kept up between both the iſlands; "but the navigation was dangerous, and per-

[r] P. 447.

"formed

" formed only in the faireſt days of ſummer.
" (Mare quod Britanniam et Hiberniam inter-
" luit, undoſum et inquietum, toto in anno non
" niſi æſtivis pauculis diebus eſt navigabile: navi-
" gant autem vimineis alveis quos circumdant
" ambitione tergorum bubulinorum. Solin. xxxv.).
" The fertility of the ſoil of Iar-ghael [Argyle]
" could never be an inducement to an Iriſh
" migration into that diviſion of Caledonia. If
" poverty, or their being overſtocked with num-
" bers, compelled the inhabitants of the pre-
" tended Dalrietta, or the Route in the county of
" Antrim, to go in queſt of foreign ſettlements,
" they ought in common prudence to have tried
" their fortune in the ſouthern diviſion of their
" own country, and not in the ſterile mountains of
" the weſtern Caledonia [1]."

In making theſe Extracts, I am obliged to tranſcribe Mr. Macpherſon line by line, in order to give each argument its full play, and to act honourably with him and the reader. And each argument, like this, is a mere Sorites, an accumulation of little reaſons, that, inconſiderable in themſelves, may appear important in their union. But, in order to anſwer the whole, I muſt reduce it into its conſtituent parts, examine each

[1] So Sir G. Mackenzie, p. 375 and 405, vol. i. aſſerts the Iriſh ſea to have been generally not navigable in curraghs, and alſo quotes Solinus for it.

ſeparately,

ſeparately, and then ſee the joint reſult of all.

The import of the firſt poſition is, that no colony of Iriſh could have migrated into Caledonia, becauſe their veſſels were ſo ſlight and the navigation ſo dangerous. This is directly pointed againſt the aſſertion of Bede. And, could the poſition be proved, the aſſertion muſt be given up.—But, in order to prove it, Mr. Macpherſon has introduced a foreign circumſtance into the fact. And he argues, that no colony of Iriſh, *ſufficient to occupy the weſtern Highlands and iſles*, could have come over *at once*. Bede does not aſſert, that the colony was ſufficient to occupy the weſtern Highlands and iſles, whether by *occupying* Mr. Macpherſon means a forcible reduction or a compleat inhabitation of them. And Mr. Macpherſon is therefore arguing, not againſt Bede, but againſt ſome writer in nubibus. Bede ſays thus. Procedente — tempore Britannia, poſt Britones et Pictos, tertiam Scottorum nationem in Pictorum parte recepit; qui, duce Reudâ de Hiberniâ progreſſi, vel amicitiâ vel ferro ſibimet inter eos *ſedes quas hactenus habent vindicarunt* —. Eſt autem ſinus maris permaximus, qui antiquitus gentem Britonum a Pictis ſecernebat, qui ab occidente in terras longo ſpatio erumpit, ubi eſt civitas Britonum munitiſſima uſque hodie, quæ vocatur Alcluith; *ad cujus* videlicet *ſinûs partem*

ſeptentrionalem Scotti, quos diximus, advenientes, ſibi locum patriæ fecerunt [1]. Bede, we ſee, fixes not the Scots along the weſtern Highlands and iſles, but merely upon the northern bank of the Clyde. And Mr. Macpherſon, involuntarily indeed, has diſguiſed the aſſertion of Bede in order to overthrow it, and has loaded it with an extraordinary circumſtance to make it appear extravagant.—Nor is the declaration, concerning the nature of the veſſels and the navigation, leſs ſtrained or leſs unjuſt. Mr. Macpherſon has miſrepreſented the curraghs, deſcribing one of them as contained within the compaſs of a ſingle hide. But his quotation from Solinus ſays no ſuch thing: Vimineis alveis quos circumdant ambitione tergorum bubulinorum. Each boat was actually lined with ſeveral hides. Carinæ primùm ac ſtatumina, ſays Cæſar, ex levi materiâ fiebant: reliquum corpus navium, viminibus contextum, coriis integebatur [2]. And for Mr. Macpherſon to affirm, that the Britiſh curraghs were not ſufficient to tranſport over a body of men from Ireland, is at once to oppoſe himſelf, to deny half the facts in his own Oſſian, and to contradict the expreſs declarations of hiſtory. In p. 225 Mr. Macpherſon aſſures us, that "the ſize of thoſe "veſſels muſt have been greater than is generally

[1] L. i. c. 1. [2] P. 240.

"ſuppoſed, for the Saxon auxiliaries of Vorti-
"gern tranſported themſelves in three of them
"from Germany to Britain." And, in the pre-
ceding parts of the work, we have ſeen Mr.
Macpherſon ſuppoſing colonies to have paſſed
over from Gaul into Britain, and from Caledonia
into Ireland. Indeed the whole of the author's
hiſtorical ſyſtem, before, is founded upon the
ſuppoſition. And thoſe colonies muſt certainly
have paſſed over in curraghs, as theſe were the
only veſſels of the Britons [1]. The Iriſh of the
fourth century could not poſſibly be more un-
civilized, more unexperienced in the arts of
navigation, than their anceſtors many ages be-
fore; eſpecially as their ports, according to Mr.
Macpherſon himſelf in p. 95, were ſo particu-
larly frequented by the merchants, even in the
firſt century. And if the great colonies of Mr.
Macpherſon's Gael, his Cimbri, and his Belgæ,
colonies ſufficient to occupy all Caledonia, all
Maxima and Britannia Secunda, and all Britan-
nia Prima and Flavia, if theſe could migrate in
curraghs into Britain, and if theſe could migrate
afterwards into Ireland in ſufficient numbers to
occupy the whole compaſs of the iſland; the
Iriſh could certainly remigrate in them as well to
the coaſt of Caledonia, and even in numbers
ſufficient to occupy the weſtern Highlands and

[1] Cæſar, p. 240, and Pliny, l. iv. c. 16.

iſles. In Mr. Macpherſon's own Oſſian alſo, as I have already obſerved in the Hiſtory of Manchester [1], we ſee little armies continually tranſported in theſe veſſels from Caledonia to Ireland, and from Ireland to Caledonia. And as the firſt coloniſts of Britain muſt neceſſarily have wafted over the intermediate channels in curraghs, ſo in Gildas we ſee the Picts and Scots of the fifth century haſtily croſſing the Friths of Forth and Clyde in their curraghs [2]; we find the Britons of the firſt expreſsly declared by Lucan, to have navigated the ſeas about them in their curraghs [3]; ſuccours were ſent in curraghs from South-Britain into Gaul, in the days of Cæſar [4]; and a great army was tranſported in curraghs, even by Cæſar himſelf, acroſs the very rapid current of the Sicoris in Spain [5]. Theſe facts equally demonſtrate, againſt Mr. Macpherſon, the ſufficiency of the Britiſh curraghs for the embarkation of

[1] P. 381.

[2] Hiſt. c. xv. Emergunt certatim de Curicis, qnibus ſunt trans Tithicam vallem vecti.

[3] Sic Venetus ſtagnante Pado, fuſoque Britannus Oceano. And Pliny ſays thus in l. iv. c. 16. Timæus hiſtoricus a Britannia introrſus ſex dierum navigatione abeſſe dicit inſulam Mictim —, ad eam Britannos vitilibus navigiis corio circumſutis navigare.

[4] Cæſar, p. 73, Omnibus fere Gallicis bellis, hoſtibus noſtris inde ſubminiſtrata auxilia intelligebat.

[5] Milites his navibus flumen tranſportat, Cæſar, p. 240.

armies,

armies, and evince, againſt Solinus, the general navigableneſs of the Iriſh channel by them. If theſe ſea-boats could live in the channel between Gaul and Britain, they could equally live in the ſea betwixt Britain and Ireland. If theſe curraghs could croſs the Britiſh Channel laden with troops, they could equally in the ſame circumſtances croſs the Iriſh. If, thus laden, they were able to ſtem the heady current of a narrow river, ſwelled with all the melting ſnows of the mountains [1]; they muſt have been equally able to ſtem the current of St. George's channel. And we accordingly ſee them in Oſſian, as I have obſerved before, perpetually paſſing from Ireland to Caledonia and from Caledonia to Ireland [2].

Thus is one great part of this argument anſwered. And this, indeed, is by much the ſtrongeſt. The other is, That no colony of Iriſh could have been induced to ſettle in Argyle, becauſe of its natural barrenneſs. But this fort

[1] Cæſar, p. 237.

[2] In Oſſian, vol. ii. p. 212 Mr. Macpherſon himſelf obſerves thus: "One thing is certain, that the Caledonians *often* "made their way through the dangerous and tempeſtuous ſeas "of Scandinavia, which is more, perhaps, than the more poliſhed "nations, ſubſiſting in thoſe times, dared to venture." And Mr. Macpherſon makes the Caledonians the anceſtors of the Iriſh.

of problematical arguments may be propagated ad infinitum, and equally on either ſide of an hiſtorical queſtion. And they are of no conſequence at all, either way, as to the fact. The Scots may have paſſed over into the weſtern Caledonia, though the fertility of the country could be no inducement. The Iriſh of Dalrieta may have ſettled in Argyle, though the ſouth of Ireland was more attracting. And Hiſtory expreſsly aſſures us that they did.

P. 107. "The Iriſh muſt have been wonderfully improved in military knowledge from the days of Agricola, if it was more difficult [for the Iriſh of Dalrieta] in the fourth century to extort part of their dominions from them, than from the Caledonians, who had better opportunities to be enured to arms."

This argument is directed only againſt the ſuppoſition, of the Scots ſettling by force in Caledonia. But that is too improbable in itſelf, to be ſuppoſed by any who are converſant with the hiſtories of Caledonia and Ireland. And it ſtands directly refuted by the well-known concurrence of the Caledonians and the Iriſh ſettlers, in incurſions into the Roman Province, within a few years only after the ſettlement. The great point

as

at which Mr. Macpherſon ſhould direct his arguments is, That the Iriſh could not have fixed themſelves in Argyle by the conſent of the Caledonians. And for this purpoſe he ſhould ſpecify all the various modes of ſettling amicably in a country, and ſhew the impoſſibility, or at leaſt the high improbability, of each of theſe with reſpect to the Caledonians and the Iriſh.

P. 107, 108. "Should it be ſuppoſed that a "band of adventurers were expelled from Ulſter "by the preſſure of the Southern Iriſh, it is "difficult to account how the Picts of Britain "ſhould receive the fugitives. Either generoſity "or ſelfiſhneſs would have prompted them — to "aſſiſt the exiles in recovering their territories, "and, by that means, to endeavour to conquer a "part of a fine country for themſelves. But the "Picts were, it ſeems, ſtrangers to the moſt com-"mon maxims of policy; for, according to the "ſyſtem under conſideration, they muſt have "been of all nations the moſt tame, prodigal, and "imprudent."

This is exactly in the ſame tenour and ſpirit, as one or two arguments before. The Caledonians might be of all nations the moſt tame, prodigal, and imprudent, if the fact was true: and

yet the fact, if properly authenticated, would ſtand unimpeached.

P. 108, 109. "The Saxon auxiliaries of "Vortigern were not ſo modeſt as the Iriſh Scots; "or elſe the Picts were a people of much leſs "ſpirit than the ſouthern Britons. When the "Saxons raiſed their demands to an unreaſonable "height, the Britons diſputed with them every "inch of ground —. Had the Hibernian merce-"naries encroached upon the Picts, as the Sax-"ons did on the Britons, we might naturally "ſuppoſe that the latter [the Picts], inſtead of "carrying war and deſolation into a foreign "country, in conjunction with the Scots, would "have found employment for their arms at "home. The unanimity in expedition which "ſubſiſted for ages between the Caledonian "nations, is proof ſufficient that they derived "their origin from one and the ſame ſource."

This is the ſixth argument againſt Bede's aſſertion, of a ſettlement of Scots upon the weſtern ſhore of Caledonia. But it is obviouſly pointed only againſt a ſettlement by violence. It is therefore of no moment againſt the peaceable and amicable eſtabliſhment of the Scots in Caledonia.

But

But there are ſome particulars mentioned in the courſe of the argument, which it may be proper to notice.—The author alledges the joint expeditions of the Caledonian Scots and the native Caledonians into the Roman province, as a proof that the former did not ſettle in the country by violence. And yet, when he draws his concluſion, he infers, not that the Scots ſettled amicably in Caledonia, but that the Scots and Caledonians were "of one and the ſame ſource."—He concludes them both to have been "of one "and the ſame ſource," becauſe they aſſociated in incurſions into the Province. I have urged the argument before, in proof of the Scots ſettling themſelves in Caledonia with the conſent of the natives. And this is all that it proves. Two nations of a different ſource, being fixed in the ſame country, might naturally unite in expeditions againſt a common enemy.—And, what is ſtill more remarkable, Mr. Macpherſon, in the former parts of his work, has ſtrenuouſly endeavoured to derive the Iriſh from the Caledonians; and the Scots muſt therefore, according to Mr. Macpherſon's own ſyſtem, be "of one and the "ſame ſource" with the Caledonians, even if they came over from Ireland. So little does one great part of Mr. Macpherſon's ſyſtem unite with another. And ſo little do the concluſion and the premiſes agree together.

THESE are the arguments, by which the authority of Bede, concerning the primary derivation of the Scots into Britain, is ſuppoſed to be overthrown. And each of them, it is obvious, is without the ſmalleſt force. The reaſons urged againſt an eſtabliſhment by violence, are convincing in themſelves, but carry no concluſiveneſs in them with regard to the main point. And the reaſons advanced againſt an eſtabliſhment by conſent, are all vague and frivolous. There are various kinds of amicable ſettlements; and the author ſhould have endeavoured to ſet them all aſide. But he has mentioned only one or two. And he has particularly omitted that which I have mentioned in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter, and which was in all probability the very kind of amicable eſtabliſhment, that took place upon the preſent occaſion [*].

[*] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 447.

IV.

IV.

HAVING now advanced his ſix arguments againſt Bede, Mr. Macpherſon proceeds to overthrow the cited authorities of foreign writers. And Claudian comes firſt.

P. 111, 112. "That poet, in his panegyric on "Theodoſius, has the following lines,

"Quid rigor æternus cœli; quid ſidera proſunt,
"Ignotumque Fretum? Maduerunt Saxone fuſo
"Orcades: incaluit Pictorum ſanguine Thule:
"Scottorum cumulos flevit glacialis Ierne.

"But we may venture to affirm, that there is "nothing in this paſſage concluſive in favour of "the old Mileſian tale [the extraction of the Scots "from Ireland].— It is idle — to ſearch for fact "in the hyperboles of poetry; Marcellinus, "though particularly fond of Theodoſius, has "not recorded theſe prodigies of valour: even "Latinus Pacatius, though a Panegyriſt, ſays no "more, than that the Scot was driven back to "his

" his native fens (redactum in paludes ſuas Scot-
" tum. Latin. Pacat. in Panegyr. Theod.), and
" the Saxon deſtroyed in conflicts by ſea. — If
" the Hibernians were of Caledonian extract; if,
" from the ancient ties of conſanguinity, a friend-
" ly intercourſe was maintained between the Iriſh
" and the inhabitants of Albany; a perſon of a
" leſs warm imagination than Claudian might
" ſuppoſe that the former ſincerely lamented the
" misfortunes of their mother nation."

In this argument againſt the cuſtomary and obvious application of the paſſage in Claudian, is one thing intimated and another aſſerted. It is aſſerted, that the account in Claudian is not confirmed by any other writer, and muſt therefore be conſidered as the exaggeration of poetry. And it is intimated, that if Ireland was peopled from Caledonia, and if the Iriſh kept up a friendly intercourſe with the Caledonians, Ierne might with propriety be ſaid to lament the carnage of the Scots, though theſe Scots were not derived from Ireland, and though they were native Caledonians.

The aſſertion is not true. Latinus Pacatus, even as quoted and interpreted by Mr. Macpherſon, clearly gives us the ſubſtance of what Claudian has more fully opened. Latinus deſtroys the Saxons " in conflicts by ſea:" Claudian fixes the conflicts at the Orkney iſlands;

Quid

Quid rigor æternus cœli, quid ſidera proſunt,
Ignotumque fretum? Maduerunt Saxone fuſo
Orcades.

Latinus has omitted the Picts, who were undoubtedly and confeſſedly concerned: Claudian more accurately has noticed them. Latinus drives back the Scots to their native bogs, redactum in paludes ſuas; an expreſſion, not ſuited at all to the mountains of Argyle, but highly characteriſtic of the plains of Ireland: and Claudian mentions the Scots as the ſons of Ireland, and makes a great carnage of them. And where, eſpecially with regard to the laſt and main point, is the difference betwixt the poetical and proſaical hiſtorian? And where is the Hyperbole and the warm imagination of Claudian? His colouring is ſtronger: but his texture is the ſame as Latinus's. And it appears from both, that the Iriſh at this period were repelled in an invaſion of Britain, and that Ireland loſt a number of her troops in this unfortunate expedition.—Mr. Macpherſon's aſſertion therefore, that Claudian's account is not confirmed by any other writer, is not true. And it carries no force with it, if it was. Though the account in Claudian had not been confirmed by any one elſe, the facts in Claudian might yet be real. And his own teſtimony would have been ſufficient to authenticate the whole.

But

But Ireland, it is objected, may with a juſt poetical propriety be ſaid to lament the ſlaughter even of the Caledonians, if Ireland was peopled from Caledonia, and if the Iriſh and the Caledonians maintained a friendly intercourſe together. If both theſe facts were true, one of which Mr. Macpherſon has vainly attempted to prove before, and the other he now ſuppoſes only; and even if Claudian was acquainted with both; ſuch an introduction of Ireland, as Claudian here makes of Ierne, would certainly be abſurd. It would be abſurd in its own nature, as poetry is not to point at diſtant and generally unknown relations in its perſonifications, but only the near and the known. The former would give ſuch an obſcurity to the beſt imagery of hiſtorical poetry, as would totally prevent its effect. And, if we allowed ourſelves to interpret an hiſtorical poet in this manner, we might pervert the whole ſyſtem of hiſtory. But it would be peculiarly abſurd in the preſent paſſage. Claudian ſpeaks of three diſtinct nations, the Saxons, the Picts, and the Scots; and by his perſonifications he aſſigns them three diſtinct countries, the Orkneys, where the Saxons appear to have ſettled [1], Thule or Caledonia, and Ierne or Ireland. And ſhall Mr. Macpherſon, for the ſake of gratifying the national prejudice of his

[1] Nennius, c. 37.

countrymen,

countrymen, confound this obvious diſtinction, and make the Scots of Ierne and the Picts of Thule one and the ſame people, and inhabitants of one and the ſame country? And ſhall the ſlaughtered heaps of the Scots, for which Ierne is repreſented as mourning, be only the ſame with the bleeding Picts of Thule? Criticiſm and Common-ſenſe equally concur to forbid it.

There is, it ſhould be obſerved in juſtice to Claudian and the truth, a ſtriking propriety and preciſion in the expreſſions of this paſſage. Theodoſius fitted out a navy, and attacked the Saxons of the Orkneys. Theodoſius marched with an army, and invaded Caledonia. And the expreſſions carry the greateſt adaptedneſs to theſe two incidents. The Orkneys are actually beſmeared with the gore of the Saxons. And Caledonia is actually bathed in the blood of the Picts. But Ireland was not attacked or invaded. The Iriſh were themſelves invaders. And the language is varied accordingly. The two images, that referred before to actual engagements in the Orkneys and in Caledonia, are now diſmiſſed, and another is adopted which ſpeaks only of the conſequence and effect of the engagement to Ierne, of the ſorrow which the news of the defeat diffuſed among the tribes of Ireland. And ſuch an exactneſs and preciſion as this, ſerves ſtrongly to prove the hiſtorical fidelity of Claudian, amid all his poetical imagery.

P. 113—115. "In Claudian's Panegyric on "Stilicho, there is a paſſage which has been "often tranſcribed with triumph in oppoſition "to the antiquity of the Britiſh Scots.

"Me quoque vicinis pereuntem gentibus inquit,
"Munivit Stilicho, totam cum Scottus Iernam
"Movit; et infeſto ſpumavit remige Tethys.
"Illius effectum curis, ne bella timerem
"Scottica, nec Pictum tremerem, nec littore toto
"Proſpicerem dubiis venientem Saxona ventis.

"—There is no neceſſity to believe that the "Poet adhered to hiſtorical fact. Virgil, with-"out any authority, extended the victories of "Auguſtus to nations, whom neither He nor "his lieutenants ever looked in the face: and "why ſhould not the ſame privilege of invention, "exaggeration, and flattery be allowed to the lau-"reat of Honorius?"

The point which Mr. Macpherſon has under-taken to prove in this Section is, that this and the preceding paſſage of Claudian have been miſapplied by the criticks, who aſſert the Iriſh extraction of the Scots. "The abettors of the "Hibernian Antiquities," he ſays in his entrance upon this examination of Claudian, "—had re-"courſe to ſome paſſages of foreign Writers,

"which

" which *they wreſted to their purpoſe*" (p. 110.). But, inſtead of proving that the paſſages are wreſted, he " ventures to affirm, that there is " nothing in" the former " paſſage concluſive" againſt him, and he begs leave to ſuppoſe that the latter is full of " invention, exaggeration, " and flattery." And if this would be as readily granted as it is eaſily affirmed and ſuppoſed, the Gordian knot would be untied at once. But, if it is denied, Mr. Macpherſon is juſt where he was before, and the two paſſages ſtill bear directly againſt his Hypotheſis.

Mr. Macpherſon however argues, that becauſe Virgil did, therefore Claudian might, invent, exaggerate, and flatter. But the two caſes are very unlike. What Virgil ſays was entirely prophetic in its deſignation, and was a little prophetic in reality. Placing himſelf many centuries before the reign of Auguſtus, he predictively delineates the glories of that Emperor. And, as his career of honour was not yet run, Virgil adds imaginary to real victories, and anticipates the conqueſts which he might afterwards make. But Claudian's ſituation was widely different. He compliments his Emperor upon facts only that were already performed, and that had recently happened. And if, in a poem ſo immediately retroſpective, he had ſpecified any particular facts that had not happened, his compliment muſt have been ſpoiled by his folly,

and all the court and all the Empire muſt have been equal witneſſes of his falſehood.

P. 114, 115. "We may ſafely affirm, that "the Tethys of Claudian was rather agitated "into a foam by Saxon than by Hibernian oars. "The Saxons, in the days of Honorius, were "in ſome meaſure a maritime people: Tethys "ſignifies the Ocean: the ſea between Germany "and England has ſome right to that title, but "the channel between Ireland and Caledonia "was never dignified with ſo high a name. This "criticiſm is ſufficient to deſtroy the whole force "of the argument drawn from Claudian."

This formidable argument is ſurely a mere accumulation of impertinences. — The Saxons, even more than a century before the days of Honorius, were not only "in ſome meaſure a "maritime people," but were remarkably expert in the arts of navigation. Such they are well known to have been in the days of Carauſius. And ſuch they continued as late as the days of Sidonius:

> Saxona,—cui pelle ſalum ſulcare Britannum Ludus.

—But the verbal criticiſm here is more obſervable. Mr. Macpherſon has repeatedly ſuppoſed before, that Claudian, even in a retroſpective

ſpective compliment on a recent and notorious event, tranſgreſſed the bounds of reality, and threw in imaginary incidents; and that therefore we could not reaſon from any, even, of the facts which are recorded by him. And yet here Mr. Macpherſon can reaſon from his uſe of words only. We are taught before by our author, that "it is idle to ſearch for fact in the Hyperboles of poetry." And yet here he himſelf ſearches for a fact in ſome lines, which he himſelf ſuppoſes to be ſo hyperbolical, as to be full of "invention, exaggeration, and flattery;" and even ſearches for it in a criticiſm upon a ſingle word. If Claudian looks unfriendly upon Mr. Macpherſon's Hypotheſis, even his particular and recent incidents are all hyperbole and fancy. But if Claudian can be brought to caſt the coldeſt look of favour upon it, even his language, even a word confeſſedly poetical, is neither hyperbolical nor poetical any more.—So far for conſiſtency: now for propriety. Tethys, it is ſaid, ſignifies Ocean, a name by which the channel between Ireland and Caledonia was never dignified. And this criticiſm, we are triumphantly told, "is ſufficient to deſtroy the whole force of "the argument drawn from Claudian." But, unhappily for the author, the fact is as untrue as the criticiſm is trifling. The channel between Ireland and Caledonia is expreſsly called the Ocean by Ptolemy. Αριζικης πλευρας περιγραφη,

ης υπερκειται ΩΚΕΑΝΟΣ καλεμενος Δεκαλεδονιος.
And to ſhew what he means by the northern ſide of Britain, to the North of which lay the Deucaledonian Ocean, Ptolemy begins with the Novantum Promontorium or Mull of Galloway in his progreſs to the North, ranges up the coaſt to Faro Head as the northern ſide of the iſland, and places the Deucaledonian Ocean along it.

P. 115. "It appears not from hiſtory that "the Scots ever infeſted the Roman diviſion of "Britain by ſea: Conſtantine appointed an of-"ficer called Comes Littoris Saxonici, to take "the charge of that part of the coaſt of the "Province, which was moſt expoſed to the pira-"tical depredations of the Saxons; but of a "Comes Littoris Scottici or Hibernici we have "never heard."

This is a very feeble argument, I think, and very feebly pointed. It begins with a poſitive aſſertion, which is not true. And it ends with an inference of reaſon, which is not juſt. Though we have heard of a Comes Littoris Saxonici, and have never heard of a Comes Littoris Hibernici, yet it does not thence follow, that the Iriſh did never invade the ſhores of Britain. We might not have heard of the one Comes, and yet might have heard of the other. And the Saxon ravages

vages in Britain might be a long repetition of invaſions, and therefore occaſion the appointment of a particular officer to guard againſt them; while the Iriſh might be only a few deſcents, and would therefore occaſion no ſuch appointment. And this appears to have been actually the caſe. The Iriſh actually "infeſted the Ro-"man diviſion of Britain by ſea." But they infeſted it only twice with any conſiderable armament; once in the days of Theodoſius the Elder, and again in the time of Stilicho. And the latter invaſion extended even along the whole weſtern ſhore of the Province, from Lancaſhire to the Lands End [1].

P. 115, 116. "If the province of Valentia "comprehended the country between the Walls, "why did not the Hibernian Scots land every "other ſeaſon in Galloway? How came not the "Iriſh rovers to attempt a deſcent in either of "the diviſions of Wales or in Cumberland? "Was not the coaſt of Lancaſhire almoſt as "near to the iſle of Man, which, according to "Oroſius, was poſſeſſed by Scottiſh tribes, as "any part of the continent of Caledonia was

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 458—460.—In ſuppoſing therefore the invaſion in the days of Stilicho to have been the firſt, p. 458, I was led by probability, but forgot a fact.

" to Ireland? Why, in the name of wonder, " was a bullwark of turf and ſtone a better " ſecurity againſt the Iriſh Scots than againſt " the Saxons of Friezeland or Holland, as both " were tranſmarine nations with reſpect to the " Province? Why did the Iriſh, with a peculiar " abſurdity, land always on the wrong ſide of " the Roman Walls, which they muſt have ſcaled " or deſtroyed before they could penetrate into " the Province? It is impoſſible to believe that " all their expeditions could have been ſo ill " concerted; and this conſideration alone is ſuf- " ficient to demonſtrate, that the Scots, whom " the Roman writers ſo often mention, were inha- " bitants of Caledonia. Walls were conſtructed " and legions employed to defend the Province " from their incurſions, but fleets were never " fitted out to intercept or deſtroy them at " ſea[1]."

The author has here confounded himſelf, by not attending to the very plain diſtinction, betwixt the Scots that came directly from Ireland to invade the Province, and the Scots that were previouſly ſettled in Caledonia. The bullwarks of turf and ſtone were never raiſed againſt the former, any more than againſt the Saxons. And the Iriſh expeditions were not ſo ill concerted, as Mr. Macpherſon ſuppoſes them, on the common

[1] So Sir George Mackenzie argues, more confinedly, in p. 377.

ſyſtem,

ſyſtem, to have been. They generally invaded the Province from their ſettlement in Argyle, and were accompanied by the Picts. But they twice made a grand invaſion of it directly from Ireland. And this is a full anſwer to this ſeries of Queſtions, why the Scots of Ireland did not land in ſome of the countries to the South of the Walls. They did. In the days of Stilicho particularly, leaving "the country between the "Walls" to be ravaged by their brethren of Argyle and the Picts, they invaded the provinces that were inacceſſible to them, landed in both "of the diviſions of Wales," and now for the firſt time poſſeſſed themſelves of "the iſle of "Man." This is related to us by Nennius in theſe two paſſages. Mailcunius magnus Rex apud Britones regebat, id eſt, in regione Guenedotiæ, quia atavus illius Cunedag cum filiis ſuis—Scotos cum ingentiſſimâ clade expulerat ab iſtis regionibus, et nunquam reverſi fuerunt iterum ad habitandum [1].—Builc autem tenuit Euboniam inſulam cum ſuis [the iſle of Man, ſee c. 2.]; filii autem Vethan obtinuerunt regionem Dimectorum, ubi civitas eſt quæ vocatur Mineu [Menevia or St. Davids]; et in aliis regionibus ſe dilataverunt, i. e. Guiher Cet Guely [to Caer Kidwelly in Caermarthenſhire], donec expulſi ſunt a Cunedâ et a filiis ejus ab omnibus regioni-

[1] C. 64.

bus Britannicis [1]. Here we ſee the Scots actually landing in the ſouthern diviſion of Britain, actually making conqueſts in North and South Wales, and actually repelled from both with great ſlaughter.

Nor were they only beaten from the land. A fleet was "fitted out to deſtroy them at ſea." This appears plainly from a paſſage of Claudian, which Mr. Macpherſon himſelf has quoted in a Note to p. 112—113. It is there ſaid of Theodoſius the Elder, that

Scottum—vago mucrone ſecutus,
Fregit Hyperboreas remis audacibus undas.

Here Mr. Macpherſon himſelf acknowledges, that Theodoſius "purſues the Scots ſword in hand into the Hyperborean Ocean." A navy was fitted out by Theodoſius to deſtroy the fleet of Iriſh and Saxon veſſels, which chaced the former into the northern Ocean, obliged them to retire into the northern ports of Ireland, and then attacked and deſtroyed the latter at the Orkneys [2]. And the ſea to the North of Ireland is expreſsly denominated the Hyperborean Ocean by Ptolemy.

[1] C. S. [2] See Latinus and Claudian before.

Mr.

Mr. Macpherſon here gives over his *critical remarks* and *concluſive arguments*, as he calls them, againſt the cuſtomary application of theſe paſſages in Claudian. And what has he ſaid againſt it? That Claudian has perhaps invented and exaggerated facts; that he uſes however no exaggerated language; that therefore his Tethys or Ocean cannot ſignify the channel betwixt Ireland and Caledonia, when the channel is expreſsly called Ocean by Ptolemy; and that the Scots never landed to the South of the Walls, never infeſted the ſouthern diviſion of Britain by ſea, and were never attacked or purſued at ſea by the Romans, when the Scots actually invaded the Provinces by ſea in the days of Theodoſius, actually landed in North and South Wales, and ravaged all the weſtern ſhore of Britain, in the days of Stilicho, and were actually purſued by the Roman navy of Theodoſius to the North of Ireland.

V.

V.

MR. Macpherſon having deprived the oppoſite ſyſtem, as he imagines, of every ſupport from Claudian; he proceeds to examine the paſſages of other writers that have been employed in the ſame ſervice.

P. 116. "If Oroſius, a Spaniſh prieſt, found "the Scots in Ireland about the beginning of the "fifth age, Marcellinus met with them in Britain "about the middle of the third."

This is all that is ſaid againſt the teſtimony of Oroſius. And it is evidently nothing. Mr. Macpherſon has undertaken to ſhew, that theſe paſſages of foreign writers are *wreſted* from their natural ſignification, when they are applied to prove the Iriſh derivation of the Scots of Britain (ſee p. 110.). But the authority of Oroſius has been cited only to prove, that all the inhabitants of Ireland, from one end of the iſle to another, were denominated Scots. And his words fully evince it: Hibernia inſula — a Scotorum gentibus

bus colitur [1]. In oppoſition to this, Mr. Macpherſon alledges only, that there were Scots in Britain more than 150 years before. This may be true, and the other not be falſe. And hiſtory actually ſhews it, Oroſius and other hiſtorians declaring the Iriſh to have been all denominated Scots in the fourth and fifth ages, and Bede and others aſſerting a party of theſe Scots to have migrated into Caledonia. Oroſius therefore ſtill adheres to the cauſe in which he has been ſo long engaged. He ſhews Ireland to have been the general reſidence of the Scottiſh tribes, when there was only a ſingle nation of them in Caledonia. And Bede and others evince the migration of this from thoſe.—Nor did Marcellinus meet with the Scots in Britain about the middle of the *third* century. He firſt mentions them after the middle of the *fourth*, and under the year 360 [2].

P. 116—118. "Iſidore of Seville, who flou-
"riſhed in the ſeventh age, ſays, that in his
"time, Ireland was indiſcriminately called Scot-
"tia and Hibernia —. Iſidore is not the firſt
"learned prelate who gave to Ireland the name
"of Scottia; a biſhop of Canterbury, about the

[1] P. 28, Havercamp. [2] L. xx. c. 1.

"year

" year 605, beſtowed upon that iſland the ſame " appellation. We ſhall not diſpute with the " Iriſh that their country received the name of " Scottia ſome centuries before it was appropri- " ated to Caledonia. But no argument can ariſe " in favour of their ſuperior antiquity from that " priority. A colony of the antient Grecians " poſſeſſed themſelves of a diſtrict of the Leſſer " Aſia, which afterwards obtained the name of " Ionia. That colony, and their anceſtors in " Greece, for a ſeries of ages, were called Ioni- " ans, but their territories in Europe never " poſſeſſed the appellation of Ionia; and from " that circumſtance, will any man conclude, that " the Ionians of Epheſus and Miletus were more " antient than thoſe of Attica?"

If Ireland " received the name of Scottia ſome " centuries before it was appropriated to Cale- " donia," as Mr. Macpherſon acknowledges, then the concluſion ſurely lies very fair and probable, that Ireland was the ſeat of the Scots ſome centuries before Caledonia. And, even if any one inſtance could be produced to the contrary, ſuch a ſingle and ſolitary incident could not take away the general tendency of the argument. But no ſuch inſtance is here produced. And Mr. Macpherſon's parallel is by no means exact. It wants two eſſential points of coincidence.

The author's *insinuated* hypothesis here, for he has not ventured to *affirm* it, is this, That the Scots were originally natives of Caledonia, that they first peopled Ireland, that they there retained their original appellation of Scots, and that they appear bearing the name some centuries before the Caledonians [1]. This hypothesis indeed is very wild, as it supposes the colonists to retain a name which their ancestors never appear to have borne, and as it makes the children to have been known by their parental appellation some centuries before the parent herself. And the parallel is to be adapted to this. But it is very different. The natives of Attica were denominated Ions, before they settled a colony in the Lesser Asia: but Mr. Macpherson has not shewn, or attempted to shew, the Caledonians to have been called Scots, before their supposed migration into Ireland. The Attic colonists natu-

[1] So Sir George Mackenzie in p. 387 intimates, that the name of Scot belonged to the Caledonians before the Irish, and was probably communicated by the Caledonians to the Irish. Dr. Mackenzie also in the preface to his Lives of Scots Writers, p. 2—8, attempts to prove Ireland to have been originally peopled by the Caledonians under the name of Scots. And Abercromby says, p. 2. vol. i, that Dr. Mackenzie bids very fair to prove, that there are greater presumptions for believing the Scots of Ireland to have come from the Scots in North-Britain, than that the Scots in North-Britain were derived from the Scots in Ireland.

rally

rally ſettled in Aſia under the denomination of their anceſtors, and even retained the name when their anceſtors had reſigned it for another: but, as the Caledonians appear not to have originally poſſeſſed the appellation of Scots, ſo they actually obtained it ſome centuries after the Iriſh. Theſe are the two eſſential points upon which the parallel was to run. But it groſsly fails in both. And Mr. Macpherſon himſelf acknowledges it to fail, allowing "the colony and their anceſtors in "Greece, for a ſeries of ages," to have been "called Ionians," and yet acknowledging "the "country of the Iriſh to have received the name "of Scottia ſome centuries before it was appro-"priated to Caledonia."

This argument therefore is of no moment. And the uſe that has been made of Iſidore's authority ſtands unimpeached. But the author has made one or two miſtakes in this argument, which it may be proper to rectify.

Mr. Macpherſon argues, not upon the national appellation of Scoti or Scots, but upon the territorial denomination of Scotia, as if the latter was different from the former, and as if his argument derived a greater weight from this direction of it. "Iſidore — ſays that — Ireland was indiſcrimi-"nately called Scottia and Hibernia.—We ſhall "not diſpute with the Iriſh that their country "received the name of Scottia ſome centuries,

"before

" before it was appropriated to Caledonia. But " — a colony of the antient Grecians poſſeſſed " themſelves of a diſtrict of Leſſer Aſia, which " afterwards obtained the name of Ionia. That " colony, and their anceſtors in Greece, for a " ſeries of ages, were called Ionians, but their " territories in Europe never poſſeſſed the appel- " lation of Ionia." This is ſurely a very ſtrange direction of the argument. If that colony and their anceſtors in Greece were called Ionians, their territories both in Europe and in Aſia muſt have poſſeſſed the appellation of Ionia. And the territorial denomination muſt have commenced together with the national in both. Iſidore accordingly, who mentions the territorial name of Scotia, mentions alſo the national apppellation of Scoti. Coinciding exactly in his words with Oroſius above, Iſidore, even as quoted by Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, ſays: Scottia eadem & Hibernia — ; Scottia autem quod ab Scotorum gentibus colitur.

And Mr. Macpherſon has forgotten in the courſe of his reply to each ſingle authority, that the notions which he combats do not rely upon the credit of any of theſe hiſtorians, ſeparately taken, but upon the united force and collective import of all. If Oroſius, Iſidore, and others aſſure us, that Ireland was inhabited by the Scots in their time, and that it was therefore denominated

denominated Scotia as well as Hibernia; this forms a ſtrongly preſumptive argument, that Ireland was the primary and general ſeat of the Scots for ages before. But when Bede and others inform us, that Ireland was the original country of the Scots, and that the few Scots, who lived in a narrow confined corner of Caledonia, paſſed over from Ireland to ſettle there; this reflects a luſtre back upon the former aſſertion, and what before was only preſumptive now becomes certain. And all unite to form theſe important truths, That the Iriſh firſt bore the appellation of Scots, and firſt communicated it to their own country; that they afterwards ſettled in Caledonia, and gradually extended their own name over it; and that at laſt, as in the caſe of the Ionians above, the colony retained the primæval appellation of their anceſtors, when the parent had loſt it.

P. 121—128. Mr. Macpherſon having fairly ſhewn in p. 118—120, that Gildas's authority is not in reality againſt his ſcheme; he once more returns to Bede, as he finds his teſtimony once more poſitively againſt him. And, as before he endeavoured to ſet aſide his aſſertions from his uncertainty concerning the reaſons of the facts

aſſerted,

aſſerted, &c., ſo here he attempts to overthrow his authority by pointing out ſeveral miſtakes in him.

P. 121, 122. "Whether the Iriſh Scots obtained ſettlements of the Picts by force or favour was a point which Bede could not determine. He was however informed that they were called Dalreudini, from their illuſtrious leader Reuda, and from the Galic word *Deal*, which, according to the venerable writer, ſignified a portion or diviſion of a country. (—It is to be obſerved that *Deal* does not ſignify a portion or diviſion)."

This, the firſt argument againſt Bede, has been equally urged with another view by Dr. Macpherſon in the Critical Diſſertations [1]. But, even if it be juſt, it is of no weight againſt the authority of Bede. He might be a faithful hiſtorian, and yet a very indifferent linguiſt. He might be very authentic in his account of the Iriſh migration into Caledonia, and yet be miſtaken in his interpretation of an Iriſh or Caledonian word. What, however, ſhall we ſay to theſe criticks in

[1] P. 53.

the Gallic language, if, after all, they are miſtaken and Bede is right. We have ſeen ſeveral reaſons before to apprehend, that theſe gentlemen, who ſet themſelves up as peculiarly qualified to write the antient hiſtory of our iſland, becauſe of their critical acquaintance with its antient language, are but imperfectly acquainted with it. And we have ſeen them particularly ſpeaking before of the Britiſh language, from the view merely of a part of it, and from the knowledge only of one of its dialects. And we ſee them both more ridiculouſly ſpeaking here, from a view merely of a part of a part, and from a knowledge only of half a dialect, from an acquaintance with the Iriſh or Erſe, as it is ſpoken only in the Highlands of Scotland. For in the Erſe of Ireland Deal or Dal does ſignify a portion or diviſion. Bede's aſſertion, that it ſo ſignified in his time, would certainly be a ſtrong preſumption that it did, even if it had loſt that meaning now. But it has not loſt it. The word and its derivatives run through the whole Iriſh language, and occur in various ſhapes and forms, all referring to the original idea of diviſion. Deillim and Dealuighim ſignifies to part or divide, Dailthe and Dealuighte ſignifies parted or divided, Deilt and Dealachd means a parting or diviſion, and Duil, Dail, and Dal means a diviſion or ſhare. Hence Dail or Dal alſo ſignifies in Iriſh a tribe of people, and the region belonging to it; as in Dal-cais, a

name for the tribe of Cormac-cais, and in Dal-araidhe, Dal-fiatach, and Dal-riada, the names of three large territories in Ulſter. And the word is not confined to the Iriſh language. It occurs equally in the Welſh of Howel Dha and in the Engliſh of the preſent day, in the Diler or divider of that great Legiſlator, and in the Saxon-Britiſh Dealer, To Deal, A Deal, and A Dole, amongſt ourſelves. The word is ſo far from not being Britiſh, that it appears uncommonly diffuſed through the Britiſh language; forming a large variety of words in the Iriſh, remaining in the Welſh of the tenth century, and continuing in ſome of the moſt familiar words amongſt ourſelves at preſent. And how groſsly miſtaken are both Mr. Macpherſon and his friend and fellow-labourer, even in their own province of Celtic etymology!

P. 122. "It is remarkable, that not one "Engliſh or Scottiſh antiquary ever implicitly "adopted every part of the Anglo-Saxon's ſyſtem. "The Picts and Scots, according to him, as ſepa-"rate nations, and from very different origins, "poſſeſſed North Britain before the commence-"ment of the Chriſtian æra. Camden, Uſher, "the two Lloyds, Stillingfleet, Innes, and many

 "more,

" more, rejected some one part or other, and " some the whole of Bede's account of the South- " ern Britons; but all these learned men received " without examination his system of the Hiber- " nian extraction of the British Scots."

This argument is very trifling And Bede's account, of the derivation of the Southern Britons, may be justly rejected either in part or in whole; and yet his account of the extraction of the Scots may be depended upon. The settlement of the former in the island, was long before the existence of records. But the settlement of the latter was within the period of history. For the Scots are not fixed in North-Britain by Bede " before the commencement of the Christian æra." In tracing the origin of the five several nations that were then settled in Britain, Bede begins with the Britons, proceeds to the Picts, and, to give the large account of the Romans and the Saxons in one entire and unbroken series, immediately passes to the Scots, and then enters upon the Romans. And Bede gives us the origin of the Britons, the Picts, and the Scots, in a manner that exactly corresponds with this idea, and that particularly and strikingly distinguishes the antiquity and the recentness of their respective settlements in Britain. Concerning the migration of the Britons and Picts into this island, he expressly speaks with a dubious reference to popular opinions

opinions and traditionary hiſtory. But of the migration of the Scots he ſpeaks peremptorily and poſitively, as peremptorily as he does of the Roman invaſion of the iſland, and as poſitively as he does of the Saxon ſettlement upon it. In primis — hæc inſula Britones ſolùm — incolas habuit, qui de tractu Armoricano, *ut fertur*, Britanniam advecti. — Contigit gentem Pictorum de Scythiâ, *ut perhibent*, — Oceanum ingreſſam, &c. Procedente autem tempore Britannia, poſt Brittones et Pictos, tertiam Scottorum nationem in Pictorum parte recepit, qui, duce Reudâ de Hiberniâ progreſſi, vel amicitiâ vel ferro ſibimet inter eos ſedes quas hactenus habent vindicarunt —. Hibernia propriè patria Scottorum eſt: ab hâc egreſſi, ut diximus, tertiam in Britanniâ Brittonibus et Pictis gentem addiderunt [1].

P. 122, 123. "Where we have an opportunity to examine Bede's account by the "criterion of collateral hiſtory, we find that he "has committed a very eſſential miſtake. The "Southern Britons were ſo far from deriving "their blood from the inhabitants of Armorica, "that, on the contrary, the Armoricans had "tranſmigrated from Britain not many ages be-

[1] L. i. c. 1.

" fore Bede's own time. If Bede therefore was " in an error with reſpect to the origin of a " people, whoſe hiſtory, on account of their " connection with the Romans, was known, it " is much more probable that he knew nothing " certain concerning the antiquities of a nation, " who had not among them the means of pre- " ſerving, with any certainty, the memory of " events."

This is the third argument againſt Bede. And it is, I think, of as little avail as the other two.—Bede has committed no miſtake, even upon Mr. Macpherſon's own ſtate of the caſe. He derives the original Britons from Armorica: but he derives them very dubiouſly. In primis, ſays he, hæc inſula Britones ſolùm, a quibus nomen accepit, incolas habuit, qui de tractu Armoricano, *ut fertur*, Britanniam advecti [1]. And his derivation of the original Britons from Armorica, even if poſitively aſſerted, does not ſuperſede, as Mr. Macpherſon imagines, the remigration of Britons into Armorica afterwards, becauſe it is not contrary to it.

The name of Armorica ſeems, from the ſhifting application of it by antient authors, and from the full import of the word, which ſignifies the people upon the ſea, to have once extended

[1] Lib. i. c. i.

along

along the whole compaſs of the Gallic coaſt from the Bay of Biſcay to the Rhine. In the days of Cæſar it comprized a variety of ſtates in Weſtern Gaul [1]. In the days of Pliny it reached from the Pyrenees to the Garonne [2]. And in the days of Sidonius Apollinaris it was carried much farther to the North-Eaſt, and included, and even ſeems to have been reſtricted to, the compaſs of the preſent Bretagne [3]. In this general acceptation of the word, the Britons were certainly derived from Armorica. And at the eaſtern point of the Gallic coaſt, and directly oppoſite to the great Angle of Kent, even Bede places the Morini, a name exactly the ſame as Ar-Mor-ic-i, and ſeemingly the continuation of it [4].

Whether the Britons ever re-migrated into France, and fixed the appellation of Britanni upon the continent, has been much diſputed. But, I think, it may be ſatisfactorily ſettled. That they actually tranſmigrated, is evident from hiſtory. They paſſed into Gaul under the conduct of Maximus, and ſettled afterwards in Armorica, as is aſſerted by Llomarch Hen and by Nennius [5]. And they ſettled in Gaul upon the firſt invaſion of the Saxons, as is aſſerted by Gildas, by Bede, and by Eginhard [6]. But in

[1] P. 108. [2] L. iv, c. 17. [3] Carte, V. I. p. 7. a note. [4] L. i. c. 1. [5] Carte, V. I. p. 169. 2 note, and Nennius, c. 23. [6] Gildas, c. 25. alii tranſ-

both theſe migrations they did not eſtabliſh themſelves in Bretagne only. The greateſt number paſſed over under Maximus [1]; and theſe were diſperſed in the many regions that extend a ſtagno quod eſt ſuper verticem Montis Jovis uſque ad civitatem quæ vocatur Cantguic, from the great St. Bernard in Piedmont to Cantavic in Picardy, and from Picardy to the weſtern coaſt of France [2]. And the refugees, that were driven away by the Saxon invaſion, appear to have equally diſperſed themſelves into different parts of the continent, tranſmarinas regiones petivere. In both expeditions however, a body of them ſeems certainly to have planted themſelves in the preſent Bretagne [3]. But they never fixed the name of Britanni on the continent. It was there ages before either migration. Dionyſius the Geographer, and Pliny the Naturaliſt, both ſpeak of the Britanni, as the name of a tribe on the borders of Picardy and Flanders [4]. And Britannia, the capital of the tribe aſſuredly, was one of the moſt celebrated cities in Gaul, as early as the days of Hannibal [5]. Armorica is

marinas petebant regiones, Bede, l. i. c. 15. the ſame, and Eginhard in Ann. Franc. Uſher, p. 226. edit. 1687.

[1] Gildas, c. 11. ingenti juventute. [2] Nennius, c. 23. The common copies read Tantguic, but the Cotton M. S. Cantguic. And for Cantavic ſee Carte, V. I. p. 25. a note. [3] Carte, V. I. p. 269, from Llomarch, and the writers in Uſher, p. 226. [4] Carte, p. 5. [5] Ibid. a note.

called

called Britannia by Sulpicius Severus, at a time when it appears to have been equally called Armorica. And as Sulpicius wrote within 10 years only after the expedition of Maximus, ſo he recites the name without any note of its novelty, and even in ſpeaking of the times antecedent to that expedition [1]. And in the ſame manner, within 12 years only from the firſt poſſible migration of the iſlanders in conſequence of the Saxon invaſion, and within 4 only after the Saxons had made themſelves maſters of a ſingle county [2], even in the year 461, and even in the public acts of a Synod, the Prelate of Armorica ſubſcribes himſelf, without heſitation, without explanation, Manſuetus Biſhop of the Britons [3]. Each argument ſeparately proves, and the actual and exact concurrence of both gives a great additional weight to the proof, that the names of Armorica and Britannia were equally the appellations of the country, long before the forces of

[1] Carte, p. 6, 7. a note. [2] Sax. Chron.

[3] Uſher, p. 226.—Mr. Carte has ſtrangely ſuppoſed ſuch a number of Britons to have retired from Kent, that Hengiſt was obliged to bring a body of his countrymen, about 300,000, from Germany to ſupply their place (V. I. p. 195.).—And Dr. Borlaſe, ſtill more ſtrangely, ſuppoſes the Britons to have retired into Armorica "when the Saxons had conquered "the greateſt part of the iſland" (P. 39. edit. 2d.), though the name of the Britons occurs in Armorica ſo many years before that period.

Maximus

Maximus or the refugees of Kent could have ſettled in it. It is ridiculous to ſuppoſe, that they ſettled there in any conſiderable numbers. No numbers could have impoſed their own appellation upon the country, without an abſolute conqueſt of the natives. And as, in the circumſtances of both the colonies, a conqueſt of Armorica was abſolutely impracticable, ſo the name of Britain appears the well-known, the acknowledged, the cuſtomary appellation of Armorica, within 10 years only after the firſt migration, and even within 4 only after the laſt.

The name of Britons, then, was the antient and equal appellation of the Armoricans, as in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter I have ſhewn the names of Morini and Rhemi to have been for the Durotriges and Bibroces; was taken up in the later ages of the Empire, and at laſt ſuperſeded the other. And theſe appellations of Britons for the Celtæ of Armorica, of Picardy, or of Flanders, were all evidently occaſioned by the ſame principles of diſtinction, that planted Pict-on-es in France and Pict-i in Scotland, and that ſettled Brigantes equally on the continent and in the iſland. The principle which ſtamped the appellation of Britanni, Brigantes, or the ſeparated People, upon the Gauls that had croſſed the channel into Albion, as naturally operated to give the ſame name to the Gauls which were ſeparated from the reſt by much ſlighter barriers,

riers, by a few hills of the Alps, or by a couple of currents. And we ſee the caſe ſtrongly exemplified in the equivalent word Vict or Pict, applied, as I have ſhewn in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter, to thoſe Britons who were ſtrikingly diſtinguiſhed from the reſt by lying without the pale of the Roman Province, and equally applied to the Pictones in Gaul, who were only divided from the reſt by rivers, and to the Vect-urion-es in Caledonia, who were only ſeparated from the reſt by mountains [r].

[r] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 415—417. The word is alſo applied, in Vectis, Ictis, or Wight, to a land that was merely peninſular, and that was only inſulated at the tide of flood; and, in Portus Ictius or Wit-ſand, merely to ſuch an opening or diviſion in the land as formed an harbour: And it therefore ſtands for an iſland in the Welſh Uigt (Baxter on Vectis) and the Saxon-Welſh Ight, and for a cove or creek in the Corniſh Ic or Ict, at preſent. How wrong then are Mr. Carte and Dr. Borlaſe; the one, in drawing an argument for the conjunction of Britain to Gaul from the name of the Promontorium Ictium, becauſe the name ſignifies ſeparation (p. 3.); and the other, for transferring the Ictis of Diodorus from the iſle of Wight to Cornwall, becauſe the name ſignifies a Cove in Corniſh (Borlaſe's Scilly). The harbour muſt have given name to the Promontory. And Ict muſt have ſignified an harbour equally in the Gallic and in the Britiſh.—And ſo we have Brixia, now Breſcia, in the Gallic part of Italy, as the Britons of France now call themſelves Brez, and as Brix ſignifies a rupture or diviſion at preſent. And ſo Bruges in Flanders, Bretten the antient name of Mons in Hainault, &c. (See Carte, p. 6. and 10.).

Bede

Bede then has not committed, as Mr. Macpherſon aſſerts, " a very eſſential miſtake " here. He has committed none at all. He deduces the original Britons from Armorica, perhaps extending that name along the whole coaſt of France, and being then certainly right in his deduction. One of his reaſons was the continuing appellation of Britons in Gaul, perhaps in Flanders or Picardy, and certainly in Bretagne. And the other was the general tradition of the times. But he gives us all with a ſtrong note of diffidence, referring us to his ſingle authority, and declaring that to be only the popular opinion. By his aſcribing the name of the Inſular to the Continental Britons, he plainly ſhews, that he conſidered the name as exiſting in Gaul, many ages before the invaſion of the Saxons or the rebellion of Maximus. And we have ſeen ſufficiently above, that the name was actually prior to both.

I have entered the more fully into this argument, becauſe it might ſeem to carry ſome degree of force with it. And I was deſirous to aſcertain the triflingneſs of the Britiſh migrations into Gaul, which had been conſiderably heightened, to point out the exiſtence of the name of Britons there before them, and to lay open the grounds and reaſons of the name conſiſtently with the etymology of Britain before. Mr. Carte, purſuing the ſteps of Bede, had endeavoured to

derive

derive the name of our own Britons from the remaining appellation on the continent, but had not aſſerted the meaning of either, And he had even, contradictorily, derived the name of Bretagne from the tranſplanted Britons of this iſland [1]. And I was willing, in anſwer equally to Mr. Macpherſon and Mr. Carte, to vindicate the real hiſtory, if I could, and to reduce it into a regular conſiſtency.

P. 123. "From the political and religious "prejudices which prevailed, in the days of Bede, "between the Britiſh Scots and the Saxons, we "may conclude that the venerable writer had "very little converſation with the antiquaries or "ſenachies of the former nation. Had he even "conſulted them, very little light could be de-"rived from them in an age of ignorance, cre-"dulity, and barbariſm. Bede, on the other "hand, entertained a friendly partiality for the "Scots of Ireland.—Their benevolence and hoſ-"pitality to the Saxon Students, who flocked "into their country, recommended them, in a "very high degree, to the venerable Anglo-Saxon "(Bede Hiſt. lib. iv. c. 26.). The good man, "we may take it for granted, embraced every "opportunity of converſing with thoſe Hibernian

[1] Carte, p. 5, 6. and 194, 195. V. I.

"miſſionaries

" miſſionaries and pilgrims who came over in " ſwarms into Britain, in thoſe days of conver- " ſion and religious pilgrimage. From them he " borrowed all that genealogical erudition which " he diſplays in the beginning of his Eccleſiaſtical " Hiſtory [1]."

This is the fourth argument againſt Bede. And it is obviouſly all founded upon gueſſes, aſſumptions without reaſon, and concluſions without premiſſes. — It is preſumed, that Bede had very little converſation with the Caledonians, and a great deal with the Iriſh. It is therefore inferred, that he derived his account of the Scots, not from the former, but from the latter. And it is again inferred, that his accounts are therefore wrong. Such is the nature of the preſent argument. And the preſumption and the inferences are all equally unjuſt.

A very great intimacy had commenced betwixt the Northumbrians and the Caledonians, from the kind refuge which the ſons of Ethelfrid had found among them, after the death of their father in 617. And a conſiderable correſpondence was carried on between them to the days of Bede. Filii — regis Ædilfridi, ſays Bede, — cum magnâ nobilium juventute apud Scottos ſive Pictos exulabant, ibique ad Scottorum doctrinam catechizati

[1] So the Prefacer to Dr. Macpherſon, p. vi and xiii.

ſunt.

ſunt [1]. And a few years afterward Oſwald the king, and a number of adherents with him, were received with equal hoſpitality, and were equally baptized, among the Scots: inter quos exulans Ipſe Baptiſmatis ſacramenta, cum his qui ſecum erant militibus, conſecutus erat [2]. At Oſwald's departure from the country, he appears to have made himſelf a perfect maſter of the Scotch language: tam longo exilii ſui tempore linguam Scottorum jam plenè didicerat [3]. And, upon his recovery of Northumbria from Cadwallaun, he ſent and procured a biſhop and various other teachers from the Country, and the Northumbrians became the pupils and diſciples of the Scots: miſit ad majores natu Scottorum —, petens ut ſibi mitteretur antiſtes —; accepit — pontificem Aidanum —; exin cæpere plures per dies de Scottorum regione venire Britanniam, atque illis Anglorum provinciis quibus regnavit rex Oſuald — verbum fidei prædicare —; imbuebantur præceptoribus Scottis parvuli Anglorum [4]. And this continued the regular ſtate of Northumbria for 30 or 40 years together, the three ſucceſſive biſhops of Northumbria being all Scotch, king Oſwi and biſhop Chad being well acquainted with the Scotch language, and even the ſoutherly

[1] Bede, l. iii. c. 1.
[2] L. iii. c. 3.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Ibid.

kingdom

kingdom of Mercia being governed at the ſame period by two ſucceſſive Scotch biſhops [1]. This continued to the year 664 [2]. And a frequent intercourſe was carried on by the Northumbrians with the Scots and Picts afterwards, even to the death of Bede. This hiſtorian was born within nine years after the termination of the Scottiſh biſhops, and finiſhed his hiſtory in the 59th year of his age and the 731ſt after Chriſt [3]. King Ofwi, who had been educated among the Scots [4], extended his empire over a part of the Picts, and ſubjected his new dominions to the one biſhop of Northumbria [5]. Theſe were afterwards, in 681, formed into a ſeperate dioceſs by king Egfrid [6], and continued ſo to the year 685 [7]. In the year 701 Adamnan, the Abbot of Hii, was ſent on an embaſſy by the Scots to Alfrid king of Northumbria, reſided ſome time in the country, and was converted by the Northumbrian ſcholars to the Saxon mode of obſerving Eaſter [8]. In 710 the monarch of the Picts ſent embaſſadors to Ceolfrid, the Abbot of Bede's own monaſtery, who had converſed with Adamnan before [9], and with whom Bede was then, and had been for

[1] L. iii. c. 21, 24, and 25.
[2] C. 26.
[3] P. 795, Smith.
[4] L. iii. c. 25 and 29.
[5] L. iv. c. 3.
[6] L. iv. c. 12.
[7] L. iv. c. 26.
[8] L. v. c. 15.
[9] P. 215.

very

very many years, resident in the monastery; requesting proper information from him concerning the observance of Easter [1]. The information was given, and all the Picts conformed to the Saxon mode [2]. And in 716 Egbert, a Northumbrian clergyman, went among the Scots, resided 13 years with them, and converted numbers of them to the same mode [3]. From this particular detail of facts it appears plainly, that Bede had sufficient opportunities of conversing with the Caledonians and Caledonian Scots, and of knowing the origin of the latter from the united accounts of both. The political and religious prejudices of the Saxons are shewn to have been pretty equal against the Caledonians and the Irish. And the Northumbrians appear to have had a much greater intercourse with their neighbours of Caledonia, than with the natives of Ireland. The political prejudices of the Saxons against the former did not, as Mr. Macpherson imagines, make the communication between them small, but naturally operated to increase it by the reduction of a large extent of Caledonia, and actually united a very considerable body of the Picts for many years to Northumbria. And the religious prejudices of the Saxons against the

[1] L. v. c. 21. [2] Ibid.
[3] L. v. c. 22. and p. 33.

Caledonians, which Mr. Macpherſon alledges as the preventive cauſe of much communication betwixt them, prevented not the Saxon kings and the Saxon nobles, we ſee, from being educated among the Scots, or from inviting Scottiſh biſhops and Scottiſh teachers into Northumbria, before the days of Bede, and were actually the occaſion of viſits, conferences, and embaſſies between them to the period of his writing. For more than a century before it, the Northumbrians had been particularly converſant with the Picts and Scots. And, at it, there were no religious and political prejudices ſubſiſting at all betwixt them. Both the Picts and the Scots were then in a ſtate of peace and friendlineſs with the Northumbrians. A great part of the Scots had been then converted by Saxon preachers to the Saxon obſervance of Eaſter. And the whole body of the Picts had then adopted the ceremonial of Northumbria [1].

Thus is the main point of Mr. Macpherſon's argument refuted by poſitive authority. And ſuch is the unhappy conſtruction of this and of many of Mr. Macpherſon's arguments, that it is not only an aſſertion without proof, that it is not only actually falſe in itſelf, but that, if true, it would prove nothing. It is not of the leaſt mo-

[1] L. v. c. 23, &c.

ment

ment to the authenticity of the fact, whether Bede derived his knowledge of it from the Scots of Ireland or the Scots of Caledonia. Either muſt have been a ſufficient and competent authority for the fact. And, even according to Mr. Macpherſon's own account in this very extract, the Iriſh Scots muſt have been the beſt hiſtorians, as the Caledonian were then in a ſtate of "ignorance, "credulity, and barbariſm," and as Ireland was the ſeat of learning even to the Engliſh, and the "Saxon ſtudents *flocked* into the country."

P. 124. Having triflingly obſerved, that "the "ſudden tranſition which Bede makes from the "tale of Reuda to a panegyric on Ireland," and afterwards concluding with a new declaration of the ſame tale, furniſhes a ſtrong preſumption that he derived his information from the Iriſh; Mr. Macpherſon proceeds thus — "It is apparent "from another circumſtance, that Bede borrow-"ed his account of the Scots from the Iriſh. He "calls the inhabitants of Iar-ghael [Argyle] by "the name of Dalreudini, an appellation ut-"terly unknown to the hiſtorians, writers of "chronicles, bards, and ſenachies of Scotland, "though common in the annals of Ireland."

I have already obſerved, that it is not of the leaſt ſignification to the truth and authenticity of the hiſtory, whether Bede derived it from the Scots of Ireland or the Scots of Caledonia, and that, even according to Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, the learned Iriſh were more likely to give Bede true information concerning an antient incident, than their ignorant and barbarous brethren of Argyle. And the fact and the reaſoning here are neither of them true.

Bede aſſerts the Scots of Caledonia to have been actually denominated Dalreudini in his time: uſque hodie Dalreudini vocantur [1]. This is not a particular, that could have been borrowed from the Iriſh annaliſts. He ſpeaks of a fact notorious and public, and exiſting in his own time. It was the popular name of the Scots among the nations around them, in the days of Bede. This therefore is a fact that muſt have been known to Bede himſelf. And his aſſertion is deciſive for its exiſtence.

P. 125, 126. "To deſtroy from another "principle, the tale of Bede and the ſtory of "Reuda, it may not be improper to obſerve, that

[1] L. i. c. 1.

"the

" the learned Uſher found out that a diſtrict in " the county of Antrim, which has for many ages " been diſtinguiſhed by the name of *Route*, is " the Dalriada of the old Iriſh. Dalriada, ſays " the ingenious prelate, derives its name from " Cairbre-Riada, the ſon of Conaire, who held " the ſceptre of Ireland in the third century. But " we may venture to affirm that Uſher, in this " ſuppoſition, was very much miſled. Rute or " Reaidh in the old Scottiſh language ſignifies " a Ram, — and — Dalriada literally the val- " ley of the Ram. Uſher quotes a patent which " is preſerved in the Tower of London, wherein " it appears, that John king of England granted to " Allan Lord of Galloway the territory of Dal- " reth and the iſland of Rachrin, which is ſitu- " ated over-againſt that diſtrict. From the ſylla- " bication of the two local names in the patent, " we may conclude that the etymon we have " given of Dalriada is perfectly juſt. Rachrin, " which may, with great propriety, be reckoned " an appendage to the *Route*, ſignifies the Ram's " promontory in the Iriſh tongue; and Dalriada " itſelf being expreſsly called the land of Rams, " in the Iriſh patent mentioned by the primate " himſelf, is a circumſtance that is deciſive in our " favour."

This is the ſixth argument againſt the aſſertion of Bede. And it is obviouſly no argument at all

againſt him. It relates only to Uſher. And it has no more tendency "to deſtroy the tale of "Bede and the ſtory of Reuda," than it has to diſprove the doctrine of gravitation or the theory of the comets. Uſher's etymon of Dalriada may be unjuſt: and yet the account of the Dalreudian colony in Bede would be unimpeached. And, what is ſtill more ſtrange in the formation of this argument, Uſher may have really "found out "that a diſtrict in the county of Antrim, which "has for many ages been diſtinguiſhed by the "name of Route, is the Dalriada of the Iriſh:" and yet his derivation of Dalriada from Cairbre-Riada may be falſe. In the firſt caſe, Mr. Macpherſon's argument is not pointed at all againſt the hiſtorical fact in Bede, though it pretends to deſtroy it. And, in the ſecond, his argument is not levelled at all againſt the geographical fact in Uſher, though it is deſigned to overthrow it.

Having thus eaſily ſhewn the ſtrange incompetency of the argument in general, we ſhall have more leiſure to point out Mr. Macpherſon's other miſtakes in the courſe of it. Theſe are, That the Route in Antrim was ſo called from Rute a Ram; That Dalriada ſignifies literally the valley of the Ram; That Rachrin means the Ram's Promontory; and, That "Dalriada itſelf "being

" being expreſsly called the land of Rams, in " the Iriſh patent mentioned by the primate " himſelf, is a circumſtance that is deciſive in " Mr. Macpherſon's favour." This laſt aſſertion is an unaccountable miſtake. Dalriada is neither expreſsly nor implicitly called the land of Rams in Uſher's patent, as mentioned by himſelf. All that he ſays of it is this: Totam—Dalreth ſive Dalrede, cum inſulâ Rachlyn vel Rachrin, illi objacente, Alano de Galway, a Johanne Anglorum Rege & Hiberniæ Domino conceſſam olim fuiſſe, ex archivis Regiis in arce Londinenſi aſſervatis conſtat (Patent in Dorſo ann. 14 R. Johannis, Membran. 3. Num. 1., et ann. 17. Membran. 5. Num. 57); quam utramque nunc jure poſſideat hereditario Comes Antrimenſis [1]. And, as the circumſtance deciſive in Mr. Macpherſon's favour appears not upon the face of the Archbiſhop's account, ſo Mr. Macpherſon's etymons contradict every idea of propriety.—Riada or Reaidhe, we ſee, is uſed not only conjunctively with Dal, as in Dal-riada, but ſeparately by itſelf, as in Route. And to denominate any country ſimply Reaith or Ram, is an evident abſurdity. This overthrows the etymology of both at once. The true derivation muſt be one, that will conform itſelf with propriety to the name of Route, as well as to the appellation of Dal-riada. And ſuch is Ruta, the

[1] P. 321.

ſame in Iriſh as Route in Engliſh, and ſignifying in an honourable acceptation a tribe of people; a name, with the greateſt propriety applicable to that diviſion of Antrim which is denominated Route, to the Dal-reud-ini of Scotland, and to the Dal-reth of Ireland, and importing the tribe and the country of it. — Nor can Rachlyn or Rachrin ſignify the Ram's promontory. A Ram is in Iriſh, not Rach, but Reaith; and Mr. Macpherſon has already deduced Route and Reaidhe from it. And the other word is not Ryn only, but is equally Lyn, Rachlyn vel Rachrin. This is not a promontory, but an iſland, inſula Rachlyn vel Rachrin, and is actually an iſland, and actually denominated Rachlin, at preſent. The name clearly terminating in the word In an iſland, it ſeems to begin with the Iriſh word Rak-ol, and to import the Royal iſland. And hence it is denominated Ric-in-a, Reich-in, or King-iſland, by Ptolemy [1].

P. 127,

[1] Mr. Macpherſon alſo objects in p. 126, That "accord-" ing to the genius of the Iriſh language" Dal-riada, if called from Cairbre-Riada, muſt have been, not Dal-Riada, but Dal-Cairbre, becauſe Riada is only a poſterior and ſecondary name. But we have ſeveral inſtances to the contrary in the Iriſh hiſtory, which, however ſpurious as facts, are certainly agreeable to the genius of the Iriſh language, as Dal-araidhe in Down and Antrim from Fiacha-araidhe, king of Ulſter towards

P. 127, 128. "Uſher has aſcertained the "bounds of Dalriada, or the *Route* in Antrim, "and found its whole extent about 30 miles. "Were it even certain that Dalriada produced "more men than any diſtrict of the ſame extent "in antient Ireland, ſtill it is incredible, that an "army could be muſtered there ſufficient to ſub-"due the principality of Iar-ghael [Argyle]."

All the arguments that are founded on a ſuppoſition, of the Scotch ſettling in Caledonia by violence, have been already ſhewn to be beſide the mark. No one, I think, has ever inſiſted upon the ſettlement being originally effected by force. And the amicable concurrence of the Caledonian Scots with the Picts in expeditions into the Roman province, within a few years only after their firſt eſtabliſhment in Britain, is a full and convincing proof, as I have already remarked, that the one fixed themſelves in the country with the entire conſent of the other.

wards the middle of the third century, and as Dal-Cais from Cormac-Cais, king of Munſter and Leinſter in the ſame century.—Rachryn ſeems to be equally the true name with Rachlyn, as the iſlet is called Rechru and Rachrea in Adamnan's Life of Columba (L. i. c. 5. p. 340, and L. ii. c. 41. p. 361, Colgan's Acta Sanctorum Hiberniæ, vol. ii.). And this is Reich-er-y, or Rach-er-ea, the Kingman's iſland, literally.

THE author here diſmiſſes Bede for the ſecond time. And what he has advanced againſt him, Iſidore, and Oroſius, are reaſonings merely problematical, arguments that have forgot their direction, and proofs that evince nothing; violent aſſertions without authority, ſtrong depoſitions in the face of hiſtory, and etymologies egregiouſly fantaſtical and trifling. This account, I hope, is not too ſevere. I give it merely from my own feelings, ſenſibly offended as they have been through the whole courſe of this ſection. And, while I wiſh to be polite to Mr. Macpherſon, I cannot but ſeverely condemn the negligence and haſtineſs of the hiſtorian.

VI.

VI.

DISMISSING theſe ſemblances of reaſons, Mr. Macpherſon now advances to what he denominates in the margin his "concluſive arguments." And, here at leaſt, we ſhall meet with reaſonings that may be worthy of the author.

P. 129. "As a concluding argument againſt "the Hibernian extraction of the Scots, it may "not be improper to obſerve, that the Caledo-"nians might be called Hibernians, their coun-"try in general Hibernia, and the weſtern "diviſion of it Ierna or Yverdhon, without de-"riving their blood from the Iriſh. The Saxons "of England, it is well known, had their Norfolk "and Suffolk, and the appellation of Southerons "and Norlands are not hitherto totally extin-"guiſhed among the Scots [the Scotch Low-"landers]: the antient Picts, in like manner, "were divided into two great tribes, the Vectu-"riones and Deucaledones, the inhabitants of the "Northern

" Northern and Southern diviſions, according to " the teſtimony of Marcellinus. (Eo tempore " Picti in duas gentes diviſi, Deucaledonas et " Vecturiones. Ammian. Marcellin. lib. xxvii. " Camdenus, vir in patriâ hiſtoriâ illuſtrandâ ac- " curatiſſimus, legendum putat Deucaledonios, " velut ſic nominatos ab occiduâ Scotiæ orâ, quà " Deucaledonius oceanus irrumpit)."

This, we ſee, is called " a concluding argu- " ment" by Mr. Macpherſon. And I am ſorry to obſerve, that it appears upon the very face of it, it appears even as Mr. Macpherſon has ſtated it, to amount to no proof, to amount not even to a preſumption, but to riſe only to a mere poſſibility. " As a concluding argument—, it " may be proper to obſerve, that the Caledo- " nians *might* be called Hibernians &c." Nor is the argument any other in itſelf, as it infers, that the Caledonians *might* be called Hibernians, becauſe the Saxons had a Norfolk and Suffolk, the Scots were once divided into Southerons and Norlands, and the Picts were once broken into Northern and Southern Vecturiones and Deucaledones. And this is ſurely the firſt, merely poſſible, argument that was ever advanced againſt an hiſtorical fact; and is, I hope, the laſt that will be denominated a concluſive one.

So

So far for the argument in general. Let us now examine the particular parts of it. Grosly inaccurate as it is in the principal point, it cannot be exact in the subordinate circumstances. And it is not.

Marcellinus does not say, as he is here quoted, that the Vecturiones and Deucaledones were the northern and southern Picts. He makes not the least mention of either North or South. And he was unacquainted with the name of *Deu*caledones, though Mr. Macpherson, in direct contradiction to his own Latin note, quotes him as using it. Picti in duas gentes divisi, he says, *Di*calidonas et Vecturiones. The Vecturiones I have shewn in the History of Manchester to be only a single tribe, that inhabited a part of Perth and Mar, and all Gawry, Angus, and Merns, between them [1]. And *Dy*caledones I have equally shewn to be the same word with *Deu*caledones in British, and Ammianus's text therefore to need no alteration [2]. These Mr. Camden very justly supposed to be the tribes along the Deucaledonian Ocean of Ptolemy. But their name does not signify a position to the West, as Mr. Camden imagined, or a situation to the North, as Archbishop Usher and Mr. Macpherson suppose. These and Baxter interpret Deu the West, the North, and the South. But it

[1] P. 10. [2] P. 423.

plainly

plainly relates to none of them. Du or Deu ſignifies Water, as in Du-bana, the river Ban in Ireland, and as in Deu-draeth, or the Sea-beach, the name of ſeveral places in Wales [1]. And the nations of weſtern Caledonia were denominated Deu-caledon or the Maritime Caledonians, as the weſterly tribes of Gaul were named Aremorici or the Gauls of the ſhore; as a ſingle maritime people in Gaul and in Britain was called Morini and Durotriges, the people of the Sea, or the inhabitants on the Water; and as the Highlanders that live in a line along the ſhore of Scotland, in Roſs, Sutherland, and Cathneſs, are ſometimes denominated by their interior brethren An-Dua-Ghael, or the Water-Britons, to the preſent moment [2].

From this account it is plain, that the paſſage in Ammianus has been hitherto miſunderſtood by the criticks. He means not by it, that the great ſociety of the Picts was divided into Dicaledones and Vecturiones. The Vecturiones were only a ſingle tribe on the Eaſt. And the Dicaledones comprehended only a few tribes on the Weſt. All the other nations in the Eaſt, the North, and the South of Caledonia, according to this interpretation, are thrown out of the number of the Picts, and ranked as different and

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 423. [2] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 423.

diſtinct from them. The author is therefore to be interpreted, not concerning the body of the Picts in general, but of that particular army of them which now ravaged the Province. And this he aſſerts to have been levied from two diviſions of the country, from the long line of the Dicaledonian tribes, which were ſituated upon the weſtern ſhore, and from the ſingle nation of the Vecturiones, which was placed upon the eaſtern. Eo tempore Picti, in duas gentes diviſi, Dicalidonas et Vecturiones, itidemque Attacotti, bellicoſa hominum natio, et Scotti, per diverſa vagantes multa populabantur.

Thus unfortunate is Mr. Macpherſon in the commencement of his concluſive reaſonings. And thus groſsly miſtaken is he, equally in the principal point and the ſubordinate circumſtances of his firſt argument.

P. 129, 130. "If the Picts ſpoke the — "Caledonian language, they muſt certainly have "called the territories of the Scots [in Caledo- "nia], Iar, Eire, Erin, — words, all of them, "expreſſive of the ſituation of the country of "the Scottiſh tribes, in oppoſition to the Pictiſh "diviſion of Caledonia; if they ſpoke the antient "Britiſh, they would have diſtinguiſhed the "country of the Scots by the name of Yverdhon, "or,

" or, as it is pronounced, Yberon or Yveron. " Theſe names being communicated to the Ro- " mans by the Britons, or by Pictiſh priſoners, it " was natural for them to latinize them into Ierna, " Iouverna, or Hibernia. In common conver- " ſation, the weſtern Highlands are called by " thoſe who ſpeak the Galic language IAR, or " the Weſt; and when the Hebrides are com- " prehended in that diviſion of Scotland, the Ga- " lic appellation of Iar-in has been always given " to the whole. The diſtrict of Arre-gathel, or " rather Iar-ghael, ſo often mentioned in the " annals of Ireland and Scotland, as the firſt " poſſeſſions of the Hibernian colonies in Bri- " tain, carries in its name a demonſtration of " this poſition, as well as a deciſive argument " againſt the antient ſyſtem of the origin of the " Scots. Iar-ghael literally ſignifies the *weſtern* " *Gael*, or the Scots, in oppoſition to the *eaſtern* " *Gael*, or the Picts, who poſſeſſed the ſhore of " the German Ocean."

This is the ſecond concluſive argument againſt the Hibernian extraction of the Scots. And I have quoted it in all its extent, that it may not be deprived of any neceſſary part, but may ſtand the trial in its full force and power. It conſiſts of theſe two great particulars; That Iar, Eir, Erin, and Yverdhon or Yberon, are names by which the Picts muſt have diſtinguiſhed the

the Scottiſh territories in Caledonia, as the weſtern Highlands are to this day popularly denominated Iar by the Highlanders, and, when the Hebrides are included, Iar-in, and are the origin of the Greek and Roman appellations of Ierna, Iuverna, and Hibernia; and that the name of Argyle, Arre-gathel, or rather Iar-ghael, literally ſignifies the weſtern Gael, and ſo diſtinguiſhed the Scots from the Picts, as the Gael of the weſtern from the Gael of the eaſtern coaſt. And both of theſe poſitions I will examine attentively.

The concluſive argument before, according to Mr. Macpherſon's own ſtate of it and the truth, amounted only to a poſſibility. This aſſumes the confidence of certainty, and pretends to be deciſive. "The Picts—*muſt certainly* have called &c. "—*a deciſive argument* againſt the antient ſyſtem "of the origin of the Scots, &c." But the certainty and deciſiveneſs of this is little better than the poſſibility of that.

The former half of this argument makes the weſtern Highlands of Scotland to be the Ierna, Iuverna, and Hibernia of the antients. And in p. 112—113 we are referred to the preſent paſſage, as actually proving the probability at leaſt of the poſition. But, in oppoſition to it, we need only reflect upon what Strabo, Cæſar, and Mela, the firſt authors that mention Ierna, Iuverna, and Hibernia, have ſaid of each. Strabo, the firſt certain writer who ſpeaks of Ierna,

ſays thus of it: εισι δε και αλλαι περι την Βρεττανικην νησοι μικραι· μεγαλη δ' η Ιερνη προς αρκτον παραβεβλημενη, προμηκης μαλλον δε πλαγιος εχουσα [1]. Mela, the firſt who ſpeaks of Iuverna, ſays thus: Supra Britanniam Iuverna eſt, penè par ſpatio, ſed utrinque æquali tractu littorum oblonga [2]. And Cæſar, the firſt who mentions Hibernia, ſays thus: alterum [latus Britanniæ] vergit ad—occidentem ſolem, quâ ex parte eſt Hibernia, dimidio minor, ut exiſtimatur, quam Britannia; ſed pari ſpatio tranſmiſſus atque ex Galliâ eſt in Britanniam; in hoc medio curſu eſt inſula quæ appellatur Mona [3]. And theſe deſcriptions will not agree at all with the weſtern Highlands of Scotland. They are not above [4], or to the Weſt of, Britain, but are

[1] Strabo, p. 307.—I quote not Orpheus, becauſe the work attributed to him, or to Orpheus of Crotona (ſee Uſher, p. 378.), is aſſuredly ſpurious. And I even quote not Ariſtotle's treatiſe De Mundo, though it is quoted as his by Mr. Carte (p. 4. V. I.), and though it is quoted as his, or Theophraſtus's, or ſome perſon's cotemporary with both, by Uſher (p. 378.); for the ſame reaſon that I quoted it not before, to prove the name of Briton prior to Mr. Macpherſon's Cimbri, becauſe I conſider it as the work of a later period, probably, as ſome criticks have ſuppoſed, written about the reign of Auguſtus.

[2] L. iii. c. 6. [3] P. 89. [4] So the weſtern ſide of Roman Britain was called Britannia Superior or Higher Britain, and the eaſtern Britannia Inferior or Lower Britain (Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 59.).—And, as to Strabo's προς Αρκτον, all the weſtern ſide of Britain from Galloway to the Orkneys was ſtiled the northern ſide of it.

actually a part of it. They are not about one half, or nearly the whole, of the compaſs of Britain, but are actually a part, and a ſmall part, of it. And they are not divided from Britain by a ſea as broad as the Gallic, in the middle of which lies the iſle of Man; they are not one of the many iſles that lie about Britain; and they are not a great iſland, whoſe two oppoſite ſides are equal in length, and which is broader than it is long: but they are a narrow tract of country within the iſland of Britain, lie along the eaſtern border of that ſea in which is the iſle of Man, and have only a ſhore upon one ſide. Theſe deſcriptions of Ierna, Hibernia, and Iuverna, therefore, deciſively appropriate the appellations. It is abſolutely impoſſible that the weſtern Highlands of Scotland could be meant by them. And it is equally impoſſible, that any but Ireland could be meant.

Thus is the firſt part of this concluſivea rgument very eaſily overthrown. And the ſecond will fall ſtill more eaſily. It pretends to prove the weſtern Highlands of Scotland, the Iar or Iar-in of the preſent Highlanders, to be the Ierna of the antients, and the Scots of theſe Highlands to be native Caledonians, *becauſe* the Scots are called Iar-gael or the weſtern Gauls. And, even if we allow Mr. Macpherſon all his premiſes, his concluſion is unjuſt. Even if we allow Iar-gael to be an original appellation for

the Scots; even if we allow it to mean the weſtern Gael, in oppoſition to the Picts, the eaſtern; yet it will not follow, that the Scots were equally Caledonians with the Picts. It would only ſerve to prove them equally Gael with them. And Mr. Macpherſon has repeatedly aſſured us before, that the Iriſh equally retain the denomination of Gael with the Highlanders. And I have repeatedly ſhewn the name to have been common to all the tribes of this iſland.

Thus inconcluſive and illogical is the whole of this argument. The aſſertion, that the Ierna, Iuverna, and Hibernia of the antients meant, not Ireland, but the weſtern Highlands of Scotland, has been effectually diſproved by a reference to the accounts of the antients themſelves. And the reaſoning from the name of Argyle has been ſhewn to be founded upon an obvious fallacy, the ſubſtitution of one term for another, Gael for Caledon. And the whole turn and complexion of the argument is evidently arbitrary and deſpotical; aſſerting Ierna &c. to mean the weſtern Highlands, without any deductions of reaſon, and merely becauſe theſe are called Iar at preſent; and alledging the name of Iargael as a demonſtrative evidence of the Caledonian origin of the Scots, without any ſpecification of proofs, and merely becauſe the Scots and the Caledonians were equally denominated Gael.

And

And to this clear refutation of Mr. Macpherſon's argument let me add two obſervations, in order to collect his reaſonings on this ſubject, in different parts of his work, into one point of view. — Hibernia is here without heſitation derived from the Welſh Yverdhon. But in p. 56, 57 we are told, that *it is more probable* it was *not* derived from Yverdhon, and that *we may conclude* it was derived from the Latin Hibernus.—And Mr. Macpherſon here argues, that Ierna, Iuverna, and Hibernia, among the antients, as derived from the Britiſh Iar-in, Erin, or Yverdhon, muſt certainly mean the weſtern Highlands of Scotland; when in p. 55 he ſays expreſsly, that Ireland was called Iar-in by the Caledonians, and even "in contradiſtinction" to the weſtern ſhore of Caledonia; when in p. 56—57, 62, 63, 81, 94, 95, and 106, he expreſsly quotes Cæſar, Mela, Solinus, and Tacitus, as applying Hibernia to Ireland; and when in p. 56 he ſpecifies Iuverna, Ierna, Iris, Ουεργια, and Hibernia, as "various names by which the "Greeks and Romans diſtinguiſhed" the iſle of Ireland.—So groſsly inattentive is Mr. Macpherſon even to his own reaſonings before!

P. 131. "In the neighbourhood of Drumal-"bin, a ridge of hills which divided the Scottiſh

" from the Pictiſh dominions, there is a lake, " which, to this day, is called Erin. The river " Erin or Ern riſes from that lake, and gives its " name to a very conſiderable diviſion of the " county of Perth. In this diſtrict there are to " be ſeen ſeveral Roman camps to this day. " The Romans could not be ſtrangers to the " name of a country where their armies remained " long enough to leave ſuch laſting memorials of " themſelves behind. Juvenal, from the ſoldiers " of Agricola, might have heard of the diſtrict of " Erin, which he ſoftened into Juverna; and " the troops of Theodoſius might have carried the " ſame intelligence to Claudian."

This is the third concluſive argument againſt the Hibernian extraction of the Scots. And it is full of errors.

The firſt amounted merely to a poſſibility. The ſecond aſſumed the air of certainty and deciſiveneſs. And the third relapſes to a mere poſſibility again. " Juvenal, from the ſoldiers of Agricola, " *might* have heard of the diſtrict of Erin —; " and the troops of Theodoſius *might* have car- " ried the ſame intelligence to Claudian." This is ſurely a ſtrange mode of reaſoning; *poſſible* in the outſet, *certain* in the progreſs, and *poſſible* again at the cloſe; like a ninepin, great in the middle, and ſmall at the extremities.

But

But it is ſtill more remarkable, that the third argument directly contradicts the ſecond. In the ſecond, Juverna and Ierna, particularly, are inſiſted upon to have been applied by the Greeks and Romans to the weſtern Highlands of Scotland. But, in this, the names are ſuppoſed to be derived to the Romans from Strathern in the county of Perth, and to have been applied to it by Juvenal and Claudian. In p. 56 the author aſſigns the names to Ireland. In p. 130 he fixes them upon the weſtern Highlands. And in p. 131 he cedes them to a part of the eaſtern. We have been ſo much accuſtomed to contradictions in Mr. Macpherſon, from the claſhing parts of his ill-compoſed ſyſtem, that we ſhall the leſs wonder at the ſtrangeneſs of this laſt; and ſhall be the leſs ſurprized to find, that in the progreſs of his concluſive arguments, and within the compaſs of a few lines only, he ſhould thus groſsly oppoſe his own ſentiments, and wantonly overthrow the edifice which he had been ſo buſily raiſing.

Many notions in Mr. Macpherſon's Diſſertation are derived from the writers before him on the ſame ſubject. And the ſubſtitution of Strathern for the Ierne of Claudian and the Juverna of Juvenal, is particularly made by Sir George Mac-

kenzie and Sir Robert Sibbald [1]. But the opinion is a very wild one. Juvenal ſays:

Arma quid ultra
Littora Juvernæ promovimus, et modò captas
Orcadas, et minimâ contentos nocte Britannos?

Claudian ſays thus:

Totam cum Scotus Iernam
Movit —,

And,

Scotorum cumulos flevit glacialis Ierne.

And Mr. Macpherſon ſuppoſes the ſoldiers of Agricola to have carried the name of Juverna to the one, and the ſoldiers of Theodoſius the appellation of Ierna to the other. But both Mr. Macpherſon and his two originals have forgotten, that the name of Juverna is not firſt noticed by Juvenal, or the name of Ierna by Claudian. Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, particularly, quotes Mela in p. 57, as uſing the name of Juverna. And I have already ſhewn Ierna to have been uſed ages before the days of Claudian. Both were the

[1] Sir George in p. 375, and Sir Robert in Gibſon's Camden, c. 1490—1497. Edit. 1722.

common

common appellations of Ireland, when the little diſtrict of Strathern was buried in the obſcurity of its own inſignificance. And Erin and its relatives being merely denominations of Ireland derived from its weſterly ſituation, any inſular or peninſular diſtrict in Britain might receive the ſame appellation from the inhabitants to the Eaſt of it. Thus we have Britons and Brigantes upon the Continent and in Albion. Thus Ireland was called Inis Alga, and a cherſoneſus in Caledonia Elg-in. And thus we have the little iſland of Era or Erra near the iſle of Mull and to the Weſt of it, and the iſland of Era or Erin near the Harris [1]; Erin for the whole body of the Hebrides; Ierna on the weſtern ſide of Loch Fyn in Argyle, and Iernus on the weſtern ſide of Ireland; and Hierna in the days of the Romans, and two Erns and two Stratherns at preſent, even upon the eaſtern ſide of Caledonia [2].

[1] See Irwin's Hiſt. Scot. Nomenclatura Latino-Vernacula, 1682, p. 71.

[2] See the Roman ſtation, ad Hiernam, in Richard, Iter 9. And ſee Buchanan, p. 39. vol. i. Ruddiman, for an Ern in Murray, and an Ierna along it, and Ptolemy for the river Iernus in Ireland.

THESE are Mr. Macpherſon's three concluſive arguments. And ſurely without any aggravation it may be truly ſaid of them, that they are vague, contradictory, and weak, the unmeaning effuſions of a vivacity, that is perpetually catching at the objects which the imagination preſents before it, but finds them all illuſive in the graſp, and merely bubbles blown up by the breath of prejudice and paſſion. Mr. Macpherſon therefore, like a man diſſatisfied with his own concluſions, ſtill quivers about the point, and ſtill adds only to his own embarraſſment. After his three concluſive arguments, his doctrine wants new arguments to ſupport it. And theſe he gives us in the five following pages.

P. 132. "In vain has Stillingfleet obſerved, "that there muſt have been a ſea between Britain "and the Ierna of Claudian.

"Totam cum Scottus Iernam
"Movit, et infeſto ſpumavit remige Tethys.

"Tethys, or the Ocean, it has been already "ſhewn, was rather agitated into a foam by "Saxon, than by Scottiſh rowers. But, not to "inſiſt

" inſiſt upon that criticiſm, if by Ierna we are " to underſtand I A R, the weſtern diviſion of " Caledonia, from Glotta to Tarviſium, the " many extenſive arms of the ſea, which indent " that coaſt, will, at once, remove the learned " prelate's objection. Should we ſuppoſe that " Iar-in, or the weſtern iſlands of Scotland, were " the Ierna of Claudian, the objection will al- " together vaniſh, as many of theſe iſlands are " at a much greater diſtance than Ireland itſelf " from the continent of Caledonia. (Stilling- " fleet remarks, that if Strathern, in the county " of Perth, ſhould be admitted to be the Ierna of " Claudian, it would be ridiculous in the poet to " ſay, that *the Scots put in motion the whole of a* " *ſmall* diſtrict of their country. The biſhop did " not recollect, that it was very common with the " antient poets to put a part of a country for the " whole. Latium is often uſed for the Roman " empire; Mycænæ for all the ſtates of Greece; " and Thule, by Claudian himſelf, for North- " Britain.

" Quem littus aduſtæ
" Horreſcit Libyæ et ratibus impervia Thule.)."

This argument, taking in the whole of what is ſaid in the note as well as in the text, is founded merely upon ſuppoſitions, one implied, and

and the other two confeſſed and acknowledged to be ſuch. "It was very common with the "antient poets," ſays Mr. Macpherſon, "to put "a part of a country for the whole." And it is thence implied that this *may* be the caſe with Claudian here. And "*if* by Ierna we are to "underſtand — the weſtern diviſion of Caledo-"nia, &c.; *ſhould we ſuppoſe* that Iar-in, or the "weſtern iſlands of Scotland, were the Ierna of "Claudian, &c." And an argument of an hypothetical nature can plainly be of no ſervice againſt a poſitive objection.—But let us deſcend to particulars.

Mr. Macpherſon ſays, that "*he has already ſhewn* "Tethys to be agitated into a foam by Saxon "rather than Scottiſh rowers." He has *ſhewn* it, as he has *ſhewn* the truth of too many poſitions in his work. He has *affirmed* it. His *demonſtration* is in p. 114, and runs thus; "We may "ſafely *affirm*, that the Tethys of Claudian was "rather agitated into a foam by Saxon than by "Hibernian oars."

If we will but allow our author to ſuppoſe three things, he will entirely overthrow biſhop Stillingfleet's objection. Give me but a footing in another ſphere, ſays our hiſtorical Archimedes, and I will ſhake this at pleaſure. And yet, even if we allow him his ſuppoſitions and his footing, the prelate's argument and the globe will remain equally

equally unhinged. — Should we ſuppoſe with Mr. Macpherſon, that Claudian puts a part for the whole when he ſpeaks of Ierna[1]; neither Strathern, nor any other part of Caledonia, can be allowed to claim the appellation of Ierna. Claudian ſays,

Incaluit Pictorum ſanguine Thule,
Scotorum cumulos flevit glacialis Ierne.

Here Ierne cannot mean any part of Caledonia, and be poetically put for the whole of it; becauſe Caledonia itſelf is mentioned immediately before, as Mr. Macpherſon here acknowledges it to be in another place, under the name of Thule. And the Ierna of one paſſage, and the Ierne of the other, are undoubtedly the ſame country.— Should the Ierne of Claudian be ſuppoſed to mean all the weſtern diviſion of Caledonia, the extenſive arms of the ſea upon that coaſt can never come up to the Tethys of Claudian. Or ſhould Ierne be even ſuppoſed to mean the weſtern iſles of Caledonia, even the ſea betwixt them and Caledonia can never comport with the Tethys of the poet. They obviouſly cannot, in the plain unwreſted ſignification of the word, Tethys or Ocean. And they undoubtedly cannot, according to Mr. Macpherſon himſelf. According to him, Tethys is too great a name to be applied even to the whole wide ſea betwixt Ireland and Caledonia. "Tethys ſigni-

[1] This argument is equally urged by Sir G. Mackenzie, p. 410.

"fies

" ſies Ocean: the ſea betwixt Germany and Eng-
" land has ſome right to that title, but the
" channel betwixt Ireland and Caledonia was
" never dignified with ſo high a name" (p. 115). And muſt not the name, then, be equally too high for the channel betwixt Caledonia and its iſles? And muſt it not be infinitely too high for the mere bays and lochs, that inſinuate themſelvs into the land along one ſide of the channel?

But this is not the only contradiction, in which the preſent has involved Mr. Macpherſon. He is now ſo entangled in the curious web which he is conſtructing, that, at every motion to expedite and finiſh the work, he is breaking ſome principal thread, and letting in deſtruction upon the whole. He has here advanced three ſuppoſitions, That the Ierna of Claudian means the weſtern iſles, That it means the weſtern Highlands, and that it means Strathern. Theſe are obviouſly incompatible one with another. And the contradictorineſs of the ſuppoſitions is a great addition to the impropriety of them [1].—When Mr. Macpherſon ſuppoſes the weſtern iſles or Highlands to be meant by Ierna, he interprets Claudian literally, as placing the whole for the whole. But when he ſuppoſes Strathern to be meant, he interprets him figuratively, and makes a part

[1] So Sir George Mackenzie makes Ierna to be Strathern in p. 375, and in p. 410 all the northern Highlands as far as Inverneſs.

to

to ſtand for the whole. — When he fixes Ierna to the weſtern iſles, Tethys ſignifies the broken ſea, that is crouded with iſlands, betwixt them and the continent of Caledonia. When he fixes it to the weſtern Highlands, Tethys imports only a few bays and lochs. And when he fixes it at Strathern and interprets it Caledonia, Tethys muſt obviouſly import the Friths of Forth and Clyde.—And, to crown all, the author, in his reference to what he *had ſhewn* before concerning Tethys, has actually remitted us, in confirmation of a part, to a preceding paſſage of his own, that has not ſhewn any thing, and that directly contradicts the whole of it.

P. 133. " To collect the whole argument on " this head into one point of view: The Scots " of Britain lived in a cold climate; their country " was ſituated to the Weſt of ſuch neighbours, " as had an immediate communication with the " Romans. The Iriſh lay under the ſame diſ- " advantage of unfriendly ſeaſons; and their " iſland was ſimilarly ſituated. The hiſtorians " and poets of the Empire, and the Geographers " of Greece and Rome, exaggerated—the ſeve- " rity of the climate under which both the Scottiſh " nations lived. From an exact conformity of

" Genius,

" Genius, language, manners, dreſs, ſituation, " and climate, the Scots of both iſles had a " much better title to the common appellation " of Hiberni, than Italy, Spain, and a conſider- " able part of Africa, had to the name of Heſ- " peria [1]."

We may judge of the whole argument from this, Mr. Macpherſon's, account of it. And no author can deſire a fairer treatment, than to be tried by his own repreſentations of his own arguments.

Mr. Macpherſon has here jumbled together the two etymons of Hibernia, which he had given us ſeparately before. We have been told in p. 56 and 57, that Hibernia is " more pro- " bably" derived from the Latin Hybernus than the Britiſh Yverdhon, and that " we may con- " clude" it to be formed from Hybernus. Notwithſtanding this, in p. 130 we have it directly deduced from Yverdhon. And here, in p. 133, we have it derived from both together. " The

[1] So Dr. Abercromby in his Martial Atchievements of the Scots ſays—" There was a period of time, wherein the Scots " in Ireland and thoſe in Britain were by foreigners, who " obſerved them both to ſpeak the ſame language, wear the " ſame ſort of garments, and follow much the ſame cuſtoms, " almoſt indifferently called Scots and Hiberni" (p. 10. V. I.). — And Dr. Macpherſon p. 96. argues, that the Iriſh muſt have been Caledonians from a " perfect ſimiliarity of ge- " nius, language, arms, dreſs, manners, and cuſtoms," between them.

" Scots

" Scots of Britain *lived in a cold climate*— :
" the Iriſh *lay under the ſame diſadvantages of*
" *unfriendly ſeaſons.* — The hiſtorians and poets
" of the Empire, and the Geographers of
" Greece and Rome, exaggerated — *the ſeverity*
" *of the climate* under which both the Scottiſh
" nations lived. From an exact conformity of—
" *climate*, the Scots of both the iſles had a—
" title to the appellation of Hiberni." This is a plain deduction of the name of Hibernia from the Latin Hibernus. And this derivation is embraced in p. 56, 57, is rejected in p. 130, and is embraced again in p. 133. But it is here embraced along with the other. " The Scots
" of Britain lived in a cold climate : their *country*
" *was ſituated to the Weſt* of ſuch neighbours
" as had an immediate communication with the
" Romans. The Iriſh lay under the ſame diſ-
" advantages of unfriendly ſeaſons, and *their*
" *iſland was ſimilarly ſituated.* — From an exact
" conformity of *ſituation* and climate, the Scots
" of both the iſles had a much better title to the
" appellation of Hiberni, than Italy, Spain, and
" a conſiderable part of Africa, had to the name
" of Heſperia [or the Weſt]." This is a plain deduction of the name from the Britiſh Yverdhon. That derivation is embraced in p. 130, is rejected in p. 56, 57, and is here embraced again. And thus both, having been alternately embraced and rejected, rejected and embraced,

are at laſt united in friendſhip together. But the union muſt be diſſolved. The name of Hibernia may perhaps be derived from either the one or the other. But it cannot poſſibly be deduced from both.

Having thus anſwered the main ſubſtance of the argument, let us pick up ſome of the ſubordinate miſtakes in it.—The Caledonian Scots and the Iriſh are ſaid to have had a title to the Latin name of Hiberni, from the coldneſs of their climate. But muſt not the Caledonians themſelves, as living in the very ſame country with the former, have been equally entitled to the ſame appellation?—The Caledonian Scots and the Iriſh are ſaid to have had a right to the Britiſh name of Yverdhon, from their weſterly ſituation. But muſt not the other Caledonians, the tribes that lived equally along the weſtern ſhore, in Roſs and Strathnavern, have had equally a right to the ſame denomination?—The Caledonian Scots and the Iriſh are ſaid to have been called Yverdhon, becauſe they were "ſituated "to the Weſt of ſuch neighbours as had an "immediate communication with the Romans." But is this true concerning the former? If they reſided in Braidalbin, Cantyre, Knapdale, and Lorn, as Mr. Macpherſon inſinuates in p. 128, they lived more to the North than to the Weſt of all the Britons of weſtern Valentia; and if they were ſettled only in Argyle, Lorn, and Lochaber,

Lochaber, which ſeems to be the real truth [1], they were certainly to the North of them all. But if they lived in Strathern only, as Mr. Macpherſon intimates that they did in p. 131 and 133, then they were certainly to the Eaſt and the North of the great bodies both of the Caledonian and the Roman Britons. And, even if the Caledonian and the Iriſh Scots had been placed to the Weſt, would this be a competent reaſon for appropriating the name of Yverdhon to them? Muſt not all the Britons, from the mouth of the Cluyd to the French channel, have been equally with either entitled to the name of Yverdhon? For were they not at all, at leaſt equally, ſituated "to the Weſt of ſuch neighbours as had an immediate communication with "the Romans?" And does not the name of Hibernia appear long before the Romans had any ſettlement in the iſland? Mr. Macpherſon in p. 56 acknowledges that it does, affirming Cæſar to be the firſt that mentions the name.—The Caledonian and the Iriſh Scots are ſaid to have had a title to the name of Hiberni, "from an "exact conformity of *genius*, *language*, *manners*, "and *dreſs*," as well as ſituation and climate. But muſt not almoſt all the other Britons, all that were in any of the northern and mediterranean regions of the iſland, have been equally

[1] Bede fixes them on the northern ſide of the Clyde.

entitled to the ſame appellation, as they were equally conformable in all?

THUS have I gone through the ſeveral parts of this collective proof. And I have dwelt the longer upon it, as it is Mr. Macpherſon's own account of his own greateſt argument; in order to ſhew it to him in its true colours, unthinking, inconſiſtent, and trifling.

VII.

FROM p. 137 to 141 Mr. Macpherſon is employed in tracing the riſe and progreſs of the fiction, the migration of the Iriſh into Caledonia; before he has been able to prove it one, and when even afterwards he formally endeavours to prove it. *All* his proofs ſhould certainly have come firſt. And his hiſtory of the fiction ſhould have followed at the cloſe of the whole.

From

From p. 141 to 146 Mr. Macpherſon is engaged in producing ſome negative arguments, as he himſelf calls them, in favour of his own doctrine. But as in p. 146 he proceeds to his poſitive reaſons, it is not worth the while to ſtay and attack the negative. A wiſe enemy will not blunt his ſword in the ſlaughter of the Velites, when the Legionaries are advancing to the charge againſt him.

Mr. Macpherſon boaſtingly profeſſes in p. 137 to "conclude for ever the controverſy by argu-"ments, which, though obvious, are new and "deciſive." And in p. 146 he triumphantly threatens, by collecting into one point of view the moſt ſtriking of Dr. Macpherſon's arguments, and adding ſome obſervations of his own to them, "to quaſh for ever a ſyſtem which has been ſo "long impoſed for truth upon the world."

P. 146. "Alba or Albin, it has been already "obſerved, was the firſt name given to this "iſland by the Gael, who tranſmigrated from "Belgium into the more elevated country of "Britain. Hence proceeded the Albion of the "Greeks, and the Albium of the Roman lan-

" guage [1]. — The antient Scots, in all the ages " to which our information extends, agreed in " calling Scotland Alba or Albania. The " Highlanders and the inhabitants of the He- " brides have, to this day, no other name but " Alba for Scotland, and they invariably call " themſelves Albanich, or Genuine Britons. The " uninterrupted uſe of this national appellation, " from the earlieſt account we have of their hiſ- " tory, furniſhes a moral demonſtration, that " they are the true deſcendants of the firſt inha- " bitants of Britain. Had they been of Iriſh " extraction, they and their anceſtors would have " undoubtedly aſſumed a name more ſuitable to " their origin [2]."

The cuſtom of the Highlanders, in conſtantly calling their country Alba or Alban, and in denominating themſelves Albanich, is here eſteemed a moral demonſtration of their deſcent from the firſt inhabitants of the iſland, who called it Albion. But it is obviouſly no demonſtration of ſuch a deſcent at all. For, even ſuppoſing the firſt inhabitants of Albion to have diſtinguiſhed them-

[1] Albium is a word unknown to the Romans, and is merely Buchanan's arbitrary tranſlation of the Greek Albion. See his Hiſtory.

[2] So Sir G. Mackenzie derives the name Albanech from the original name of the iſland, Albion, p. 387. And ſo Dr. Macpherſon, p. 116.

ſelves

ſelves by the name of Albanich, the preſervation of the name by the Highlanders would prove no more their particular and peculiar deſcent from the firſt inhabitants; than the retention of the name of Britons by the Strathclydenſes, in the eighth and ninth ages, would prove them the appropriated remains of the Britanni, to the excluſion of the Galloweſe, the Welſh, and the Corniſh; or than the adherence of the name of Brigantes to the Britons of Yorkſhire and Durham, in a much earlier period, evinced them alone to be the progeny of the true Brigantes. The Celtæ of one third of Gaul were peculiarly denominated Galli, and the Galli of one third of Celtica were diſtinctively denominated Celtæ[1]; and yet neither the Galli nor the Celtæ were peculiarly and diſtinctively the deſcendants of thoſe Galli, or thoſe Celtæ, who originally poſſeſſed themſelves of France. The general appellation of a nation, as I have remarked above, was frequently retained for the deſignation of ſome particular tribes in it.

But the names of Alban and Albanich, for the country and inhabitants of the Highlands, have no relation at all to the firſt coloniſts of Britain. Theſe I have already ſhewn to have been denominated Britons, Brigantes, or the ſeparated men. And the ſame name, which is

[1] Cæſar, p. 1.

now the general appellation of the whole Highlands, was formerly, and is ſtill, the diſcriminative name of a part only. In the Hiſtory of Mancheſter I have ſhewn a tribe of the Caledonians to have been called Albanii, and to have inhabited a part of Athol, Braidalbin, Strathern, and Menteith [1]. And Braid-Albin remains to this day the appropriate appellation of a diſtrict in the Highlands. Were the Albanii therefore, or are the inhabitants of Braidalbin, peculiarly derived from the firſt inhabitants? And a long range of country, that ran in a narrow ſlip from Derbyſhire into Scotland, I have ſhewn to have been diſtinguiſhed by the name of Alps, a denomination exactly the ſame as Alba or Alb-an [2]. Was all the country adjoining to this, therefore, in a particular and ſpecific manner peopled by the deſcendants of the firſt colony? If they were, what becomes of the excluſive right of the Caledonians to this deſcent? And, if they were not, what becomes of the argument from Alba and Alban? Theſe words indeed have as little reference to the firſt colony, as to the inhabitants of the moon. The preſervation of the name of Alp or Alb, in ſo many parts of the iſland, ſhews the iſland and thoſe parts of it to have been denominated from one common principle of

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 410.

[2] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 140.

ſameneſs,

ſameneſs. Albion, according to Mr. Macpherſon himſelf in p. 39, ſignifies the High Land, and in reality imports the Heights. Hence it became the natural deſignation of that part of our iſland, which muſt have been ſeen from the continent, before any of it was inhabited: and what had for ages been the name of all that was ſeen, as naturally remained the appellation of all of it afterwards. Hence it was the name of the Albanii of Veſpaſiana, who lived in the peculiarly mountainous parts of the moſt mountainous regions of Caledonia. Hence it was affixed formerly to the long ridge of hills that runs from Derbyſhire into Scotland, and remains affixed to the wild hills of Braidalbin at preſent. And hence the Highlanders in general to this day diſtinguiſh their country by the title of Alba or Alb-an, High Land or High Lands, and denominate themſelves the Alban-ich or Highlanders.

But it is very obſervable in the conduct and direction of Mr. Macpherſon's argument here, that, even if every thing was true as it is ſtated by Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, the point propoſed would not be proved at all. The queſtion betwixt Mr. Macpherſon and his antagoniſts is not, whether the whole body of the antient Caledonians or preſent Highlanders be derived from Ireland, but whether a body of Iriſh did not come over

over into Caledonia, and communicate their own name of Scots to the Caledonians. Mr. Macpherſon, however, has taken the former queſtion for the latter, and argues from that. Not attempting to prove, that no Iriſh paſſed over into the Highlands, and communicated their own name of Scot to the Highlanders, he endeavours to prove only, that the Highlanders do not now acknowledge any Iriſh appellation for their own. This, we ſee, is foreign to his purpoſe. The Highlanders may not do it, and yet may have been conquered by the Iriſh Scots, and may therefore be denominated Scots by others. The Welſh do not acknowledge the appellation of Engliſh, though they have been conquered by the Engliſh, and are therefore reputed as Engliſh in every nation abroad. And the Saxons of all Valentia, being now reduced under the dominion of the Scots, are regularly conſidered as Scots even among their brethren of England.

And there is ſtill another remark to be made upon this argument, which evinces ſtill more the great want of preciſion and diſtinctneſs in Mr. Macpherſon's ideas and reaſonings.—Even if the Highlanders had been peculiarly denominated Albanich or Albanii, even if this had proved them the peculiar progeny of the firſt coloniſts of Britain, and even if the queſtion had been, whether the whole body of the Caledonians was

derived

derived from the Iriſh; all theſe conceſſions would not have enabled the argument, to prove the Highlanders not deſcended from the Iriſh. The Highlanders, on this allowance, having been denominated Albanich from their peculiar anceſtors, the firſt coloniſts of the iſland; but being at the ſame time, according to Mr. Macpherſon, the actual progenitors of the Iriſh; the Iriſh muſt have been the progeny of the firſt coloniſts, equally with the Highlanders. And Mr. Macpherſon, with a ſtrange inconſiſtency, even acknowledges in p. 39, that the Iriſh retain the name of Alba or Albin equally with the Caledonians, as the name of the Highlands, to the preſent period [1].

Such is the firſt of thoſe arguments which are ſaid to be "equally new and deciſive," which are "to conclude for ever the conttoverſy," and "to "quaſh for ever" the Iriſh extraction of the Scots. And, if the reſt be like this, we may ſafely affirm, that they will not prove *very* deciſive, the controverſy will not be *abſolutely* concluded, and the Iriſh extraction of the Scots will not be *totally* quaſhed.

[1] "The Scottiſh and *Iriſh* Gael have brought down the "name of Alba or Albin to the preſent day."

P. 147. "The Belgic nations, who tranſmi-
"grated into South Britain before the deſcent of
"Julius Cæſar, retained the name of thoſe com-
"munities on the continent from which they
"reſpectively derived their blood. The auxili-
"aries of Vortigern preſerved long their original
"name of Saxons, and the Scots who ſpeak the
"Galic language have no other name for Eng-
"land or its inhabitants than Saſſon and Saſſon-
"ich. But if the antient Scots have preſerved
"among them the true name of the Engliſh, for
"ſo many ages after it had been diſuſed by that
"nation itſelf, it is much more likely that they
"muſt have retained their own indigenous
"name [1]."

This is alſo one of the "deciſive" and "con-
"cluſive" arguments, that are to "quaſh for ever"
the Iriſh derivation of the Scots. And in the
margin it is called the "ſecond proof." But in
the cloſe of this argument, when Mr. Macpher-
ſon deduces his inference from it, it amounts,
according to his own repreſentation, to a mere
likelihood or probability. — We are told in proof
the firſt, that the uſe of the name of Alba and

[1] So Sir George Mackenzie derives Albanach from Albion,
becauſe the Highlanders call the Engliſh Sallenach, p. 387.

Albanich

Albanich among the Highlanders, for their country and themſelves, is *a moral demonſtration* of their peculiar deſcent from the firſt inhabitants of the iſland. And in proof the ſecond, where the ſame argument is purſued, and ſhould therefore be carried farther, we find it only a *likelihood*, not even that the Highlanders are deſcended from the firſt coloniſts, but only that their names of Alba and Albanich were the original appellations of the country and the people. This ſecond proof againſt the Iriſh extraction of the Scots, is therefore no proof at all againſt that, but merely an argument of probability in favour of the antiquity and primitiveneſs of the name of Alba or Alban for the Highlands. It is not a new or ſecond argument in itſelf, but merely the buttreſs of a former one. — And from both it appears, that the appellation, the uſe of which by the Highlanders, as tranſmitted to them from their earlieſt anceſtors, furniſhed *a moral demonſtration* of their derivation from the firſt coloniſts, has in itſelf only a *likelihood* of being their original name.

But let us conſider the reaſoning by itſelf, as detached from the previous or ſubſequent arguments, and as only a probable proof, that the original name of the Caledonians in general was Albanich. Thus conſidered, the argument at firſt view carries great probability with it. And I have already ſhewn, what ſeems a ſtrong confirmation

firmation of it, that one tribe of the Caledonians was actually denominated Albanii in the days of the Romans. But, when we come to examine it more accurately, even in this light it is incompetent and uſeleſs. The inference, that, as the Highlanders have preſerved the antient name of the Engliſh, Saſſon, they have therefore much more probably preſerved their own, very reaſonable as it certainly is, is directly confronted by a fact. And all inferences of reaſon, on points like theſe, muſt bow down to the paramount authority of facts. The Welſh have equally retained the name of Saſſon for the Engliſh. And yet they have actually loſt their own indigenous name of Welſh. Though this appellation, as I have previouſly ſhewn, was even borne by them as late as the ſixth century, it is now ſo totally loſt among them, that the criticks have denied them ever to have borne it at all. Thus uncertain is all this ſort of argumentation. And thus does the dancing meteor continually elude us, even when we think it moſt ſubſtantial and ſolid.

The whole body of the Caledonians, however, could never have been, and are not now, denominated Albanich. The name of Caledonia comprizing all that large peninſula of land which lies to the North of the Friths, the appellation of Alb-an, or the mountains, could have been given only to the hilly part of the country, in oppo-

oppoſition to the levels of the eaſtern coaſt, and the plains immediately to the North of Antoninus's Vallum. The inhabitants of theſe I have already ſhewn to have been denominated Mæatæ, or Lowlanders, by the Britons and Romans. And the inhabitants of the hills only are denominated Albanich, or Highlanders, at preſent. The tribes of the Caledonian Lowlands were denominated Mæatæ formerly, in contradiſtinction to the nations of the hills. And the clans of the Caledonian mountains are denominated Albanich or Highlanders at preſent, in oppoſition to the reſidents of the Lowlands.

This ſecond "deciſive" and "concluſive" argument therefore, as the ſecond, is no argument at all. It is only a part of the firſt. And, even in itſelf, it is neither deciſive nor concluſive. It pretends only to be a probable proof. And it is not even that. In every view of it, it has been ſhewn to be groſsly defective and erroneous.

P. 147, 148. "Had the Scots been originally "Iriſh, *Eirinich* and not *Albanich* would have "been their proper name. So far were they "from adopting the name of their neighbours of "Hibernia, that it is well known that both the "old

" old Iriſh and the inhabitants of the North of " Scotland promiſcuouſly call themſelves Gael—. " The Welſh, in antient times, diſtinguiſhed the " Scots of both the Britiſh iſles by the appellation " of Gaidhel —, much the ſame with Gael, in " the pronunciation. Should then the Scots be " of Iriſh extract, it muſt naturally follow, that " the Picts ſprung from the ſame ſource, a doc- " trine no leſs abſurd than it is new [1]."

I ſometimes find a difficulty in diſcovering the immediate aim and direction of our author's arguments. Very ſenſible and acute as Mr. Macpherſon is, they frequently take their courſe, like an arrow diſcharged from a feeble bow, languidly fluttering in their progreſſion, and wadling obliquely towards their mark. And he ſo confounds the preciſe terms of the queſtion, that I am obliged frequently to recur to them again.

This, as the margin expreſsly informs us, is the " third proof " of " the Caledonian extraction " of the Britiſh Scots." And this, and the two preceding, have all fallen into the fallacy which I have noted in my remarks on the firſt. They have all groſsly deviated from the point under conſideration. Inſtead of proving, or attempt-

[1] The ſame argument is in Dr. Macpherſon at great length, p. 115—128.

ing

ing to prove, that the Scots did not come over from Ireland, and communicate their own name to the Caledonians; Mr. Macpherson argues, that the Caledonians themselves did not come over from Ireland. And in the present Extract he confessedly and avowedly falls into the fallacy. "Had the Scots [the present Caledonians] been "originally Irish, Eirinich, and not Albanich, "would have been their proper name." "Should "then the Scots [the present Caledonians] be of "Irish extract, it must naturally follow, that "the Picts sprung from the same source." The delusiveness of an equivocal term has imposed upon him. And the word Scot is to him what Belgium was before. But the conclusion, concerning the Picts, should surely have awakened him from his dream, and shewn him the wildness of his error [1].

This argument therefore is all an Ignoratio Elenchi. And, if every part of it was true, and if the inference from the whole was just, it would prove nothing concerning "the Caledonian ex-"traction of the British Scots." But neither the premises nor the conclusion are just.—If the Caledonians had been originally Irish, Mr. Macpherson says, they would have been called Eiri-

[1] So Sir George Mackenzie goes on in p. 372, 373, 377, 378, 387, &c., arguing with the same unobserved duplicity of meaning on the word Scot.

nich, and not Albanich. But, as Albanich ſignifies only the Mountaineers, ſuch of them as reſided in the Alban or Heights might, and would naturally, have been denominated Albanich, even if they had come from Ireland. And all the Caledonians, as I have juſt ſhewn, were not denominated Albanich. Thoſe only were ſo called that actually reſided in the Highlands. — This name of Albanich is principally retained by the weſtern Highlanders at preſent [1]. And the name of Eirinich, according to Mr. Macpherſon himſelf, muſt have been equally the appellation of theſe Highlanders, as Mr. Macpherſon alledges their country to have been the antient Ierna, and to be actually denominated Eirin by themſelves [2]. The two names, therefore, appear not as the diſtinctive and oppoſed appellations of two different nations, but are found united together as the joint appellation of the ſame people. The national deſignation of Eirinich, which Mr. Macpherſon denies to have been ever acknowledged by the Caledonians, appears from himſelf to be actually acknowledged by them. And the name which Mr. Macpherſon confeſſes, if it had been found adopted by the Highlanders, would have proved the Iriſh extraction even of the Caledonians, is found actually adopted by them, according to his own repreſentation, and even by ſuch of them as moſt faithfully retain the antient

[1] Innes. [2] P. 56 and 130.

appel-

appellation of Albanich. The Caledonians therefore, according to Mr. Macpherſon's own aſſertions, muſt have been deſcended from the Iriſh. And the derivation of the Picts from the ſame origin, a doctrine which Mr. Macpherſon very juſtly declares to be "as new as it is abſurd," appears to be right upon his own reaſonings, and to reſult neceſſarily from his own principles.

P. 148. "From the name of the diſtrict of "Iar-ghael, which, it has been always ſaid, was "the firſt territory poſſeſſed by the Hiberno-"Scottiſh colony, there ariſes a very deciſive ar-"gument in favour of our ſyſtem. Iar-ghael is "not the name of the country, but of thoſe who "inhabited it from the earlieſt times. It ſignifies "*the weſtern Gael* in oppoſition to the *eaſtern* "*Gael*, or the Picts, who poſſeſſed the ſhore of "the German Ocean. But what is concluſive "againſt the Iriſh ſyſtem is, that Caeldoch, or "the country of the Gael, which the Romans "ſoftened into Caledonia, is the only name by "which the Highlanders diſtinguiſh that diviſion "of Scotland which they themſelves poſſeſs."

This is called the "fourth proof" againſt the Iriſh extraction of the Scots. And it is actually the laſt. Let us therefore examine it with par-

ticular attention. This is intended to leave the whole hypotheſis with the ſtrongeſt impreſſion upon the mind. And it is accordingly proclaimed by its author to be "a very deciſive argument in "favour of his ſyſtem," and abſolutely "conclu- "ſive againſt the Iriſh."

This is called the "fourth proof." But it obviouſly conſiſts of two diſtinct and ſeparate proofs. And, as the firſt was unwarily broken into two, ſo two are combined together in the fourth.

The former of them is called "a very deciſive "argument," and is mentioned equally as ſuch in p. 130. But it has no weight at all. For, as I have obſerved before in anſwer to this very argument, even if we allow Mr. Macpherſon all his premiſes, his concluſion will be ſtill unjuſt. This is wonderful but true. If we allow Iargael to be the name of the original inhabitants of Argyle, and if we allow it to ſignify the Scots as the weſtern Gael, in oppoſition to the Picts as the eaſtern; yet what concluſion follows? That the Scots of Argyle were equally Caledonians with the Picts? No, aſſuredly! It only proves them to be equally denominated Gael with the Picts. And, as Mr. Macpherſon has repeatedly acknowledged even the Iriſh to be denominated Gael equally with the Picts, ſo have I

ſhewn

ſhewn the appellation to have been common to all the tribes of the Britons.

Thus eaſily is the force of the firſt proof repelled. And the ſecond, which claims to be "concluſive," as the other was "deciſive," may be anſwered as eaſily. It is exactly of the ſame genius and ſpirit. And, if we allow Mr. Macpherſon all his premiſes again, his concluſion will be again unjuſt. If we permit him to interpret Caeldoch into the country of the Gael, and if we acknowledge it to be the ſame word with the Roman Caledonia, yet no inference will ariſe from either or both againſt the Iriſh extraction of the Scots. The only inference is, that the preſent and antient Caledonians were denominated Gael. But it does not prove the Scots to have been native Caledonians, becauſe they reſided in the country of Caledonia. The word Caeldoch being the ſame with Caledonia, that name can evince the Caledonian extraction of the Scots no more than this. And the whole compaſs of the Highlands might be called Caeldoch and Caledonia; and yet the Scots, ſettled in a part of the country, might be a colony of people derived from Ireland.

So totally weak and unmeaning is this laſt and cloſing argument againſt the Iriſh extraction of the Scots. And the ſeveral parts of the argument,

conſidered merely in themſelves, are equally weak.

There is a wild ſpirit of repetition, which colours over the face of Mr. Macpherſon's work. The ſame arguments preſent themſelves again and again before us, and frequently in the ſame dreſs and manner. And this is particularly the caſe with the preſent ſeries of reaſons. All of them have already received their anſwers, and have been diſmiſſed before. But they are once more returned, and demand a ſecond hearing. And, as I have given it to the three preceding arguments, for the fuller elucidation of the hiſtory, I cannot refuſe it to the fourth and laſt.

Mr. Macpherſon aſſerts the name of Ar-gathel, Iar-gael, or Ar-gyle, to have been the deſignation of the Scots as the weſtern Gael, in contradiſtinction to the Picts, who were the eaſtern. But the Scots were not the weſtern or the Picts the eaſtern Gael, either according to Mr. Macpherſon's former account or the truth. According to Mr. Macpherſon himſelf in p. 131 and 133, the Scots, as inhabitants of Ierna, were ſeated in Strathern within the county of Perth, upon the eaſtern ſide of Caledonia, and in the very dominions here attributed to the Picts. But the real country of the Britiſh Scots, according to Bede, commenced immediately from the northern margin of the Clyde, and in the preſent

region of Argyle [1]. And, according to the oldeſt account that we have after Bede, the diſtrict of Arre-gathel extended not into Roſs [2]. If therefore we limit the region of the Scots by Roſs on the North and the Clyde on the South, it muſt have contained all Argyle, all Lorn, all Lochaber, and the weſtern part of Inverneſs. But, in this poſition of Argathel, the Scots could not poſſibly be denominated the weſtern Gael by the great body of the Caledonians, as they were to the Weſt only of a ſmall part, and were to the North and South of more. And the Picts could ſtill leſs be denominated the eaſtern Gael, as poſſeſſing the eaſtern coaſt. They poſſeſſed not merely "the ſhore of the German Ocean," as Mr. Macpherſon here fixes their poſſeſſions. But, according to Mr. Macpherſon's poſition of the Scots in Strathern before, the Picts muſt have occupied all the weſtern Highlands particularly; and, according to his poſition of his Scots here, along the line of the weſtern Highlands, the Picts muſt have enjoyed all the reſt of the country. The Picts poſſeſſed, in fact, the whole extended compaſs of Caledonia, except Iar-gael, except Lochaber, Lorn, Argyle, and a part of Inverneſs. They reſided therefore to the North and South, as well as to the Eaſt, of the Scots.

[1] Bede, l. i. c. 1. [2] Innes, p. 771.

And the ſame people that were firſt denominated Caledonians, and afterwards Picts, were the inhabitants of Caledonia, even when the Romans were actually in poſſeſſion of the eaſtern coaſt. This therefore demonſtrates the name of Iar-gael, Ar-gathel, or Ar-gyle, to have not been deduced from the weſterly poſition of the Scots in Britain. And the ſyſtem, that was raiſed upon the interpretation, is as eaſily deſtroyed as it was ridiculouſly erected. Etymology, the mere menial of hiſtory, is always ridiculous when ſhe throws off her ſubjection, and vainly ſets up for herſelf.

We are farther told, that Caeldoch is the word which the Romans ſoftened into Caledonia, and "the only name by which the Highlanders "diſtinguiſh that diviſion of Scotland which they "themſelves poſſeſs." But this Mr. Macpherſon and I have already ſhewn to be falſe. That Caeldoch is not the only name by which the Highlanders diſtinguiſh their diviſion of Scotland, Mr. Macpherſon has already ſhewn us in p. 38; in which he acquaints us, that "Alba or Albin "[is] the name of [by] which the antient Scots, "in their native language, have, from all an-"tiquity, diſtinguiſhed their own diviſion of Bri-"tain." Nor is this all the contradiction in our author, concerning the indigenous appellations of the Highlands. Here, in p. 148, we are told, that Caeldoch is "the *only* name" for them among

among the natives. In p. 38 we are aſſured, that Alba or Albin is equally an indigenous appellation for them. And in p. 146, 147 we are re-aſſured, that there is "*no other* name but Alba" in uſe for them among the Highlanders. So inattentive is Mr. Macpherſon to his own preceding aſſertions, and ſo forgetful even of the general and vernacular appellations of his own country! — Caeldoch alſo I have proved before to be neither Cael-doch, as Mr. Macpherſon ſtates it, nor the ſame with Caledonia. Caeldoch I have ſhewn to be Caeld-och, and the ſame with Gaelt-ach in the Iriſh and Galatica and Celtica in Latin. But Caledon I have ſhewn to be very different, and equivalent only to the Celtarum of the Romans and the Γαλατων of the Græcians. And Gael, ſo repeatedly alledged by Mr. Macpherſon for two contradictory purpoſes, to prove the deſcent of the Iriſh from the Caledonians, and to diſprove the Iriſh deſcent of the Scots, has been repeatedly ſhewn to be the common appellation of all the Britons.

But I am tired with refuting the ſame arguments over and over again; arguments, that, like the Iriſh in the Mileſian fables, ſtill riſe after they have received their death's wound, and challenge their ſlayers to a ſecond combat.

THESE are the four arguments, which, "though obvious," were ſaid to be "new and "deciſive," and which triumphantly boaſted "to "conclude the controverſy for ever," and "to "quaſh for ever a ſyſtem that has been ſo long "impoſed for truth upon the world." And what have they proved to be upon trial? The mere ghoſts of former arguments, again introduced upon the ſtage to ſurprize and to elevate, and, like true ghoſts, pretending to a greater power and authority on their ſecond appearance, than they had in their original condition; the formations of fancy, the creations of darkneſs, and actually reſolving themſelves into nothing at the approach of light.

VIII.

MR. Macpherſon having thus laboured unſucceſsfully in the deduction of the Britiſh Scots, it may be expedient for me to inveſtigate their genuine origin. And, as he has endeavoured to make them native Caledonians, I ſhall endeavour to ſhew them as they were, the tranſplanted natives of Ireland. This may now be done with ſuch a deciſive weight of evidence, that, if Mr. Macpherſon had been apprized of it, he would never, I am convinced, have written his Introduction. And, from that evidence, the true origin and hiſtory of the antient Scots has been already given in the Hiſtory of Manchester. There Mr. Macpherſon's objections had been all virtually anſwered before they were made, and ſolutions given to his difficulties before they were ſtarted. And, as a ſecond and general reply to all his objections and difficulties, I ſhall here briefly repeat the ſubſtance of what I had previouſly obſerved upon the ſubject, reducing it all into one comprehenſive view, and confirming it with ſome additional notices.

When

When the Belgæ, about 350 years before Chriſt, croſſed the narrow channel into Britain, and ſucceſſively ſubdued all the tribes from Kent to the Land's End; and when, about 250 years afterwards, they invaded ſeveral of the neighbouring nations; numbers of the Britons took ſhipping from the South-weſtern ſhore of the iſland, and puſhed acroſs the ſea into Ireland. There the two colonies of ſouthern Britons, the only inhabitants of the country, aſſociated together into one community, under the one appellation of Scoti. Denominated Gael and Britons, from their original appellations in this iſland; they received the deſignation of Scoti, as the diſcriminative mark of their late emigration from it. The Iriſh to this day diſtinguiſh the Scottiſh language by the title of Scot-bhearla, and the Scottiſh nation by the name of Kin-Scuit. And Scuite ſignifies in the Iriſh of the Highlands at preſent, and ſignified ſo early as the days of Oſſian, an Emigrant, a Wanderer, or a Refugee [1]. Theſe, the Scots or Refugees of South-Britain, as other colonies ſucceſſively ſettled in Ireland, gradually retired from the margin of the ſea, and ſpread themſelves in the interiors of the country. By this means, the whole circumference of the coaſt being regularly planted with colonies before the days of Ptolemy, the

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 433, 434.

Scots

Scots were entirely cut off from all communication with the ſhore, and became incloſed within the center of the iſland. And, thus ſituated, they neceſſarily eſcaped the notice of Ptolemy, who juſt circles along the ſhore of the iſland, and never penetrates, as he penetrates in Britain, into the mediterranean regions of it. The Romans, in the days of Ptolemy, were maſters of all the interiors of Britain, but were very naturally unacquainted with the inland diviſion of Ireland. The Romans however, during their long reſidence of three centuries afterwards in Britain, muſt certainly have obtained a good general knowledge, at laſt, even of the midland and central inhabitants of Ireland. And Richard has accordingly tranſmitted to us ſome notices, which he collected from them, relative to the origin and the exiſtence of the Scoti there.

But, when the population of the iſland was compleated, wars commenced betwixt the different tribes. The whole body of the Iſlanders became engaged in the conteſt. They divided into two parties. The one conſiſted of the Belgic nations, and the other of the Britiſh. And the latter confederated together, like the Caledonians and the Jews before them, under the denomination of their principal tribe, and received the general appellation of Scots. The war terminated finally about the year 260. The Belgæ were ſubdued. The vanquiſhed

adopted

adopted the appellation of their conquerors. And all the nations of Ireland were embodied into one Empire, under the general denomination of Scots [1].

At the commencement of theſe wars, a younger ſon of the royal family of the Creones in Caledonia, having been ſent over with ſuccours to the Britons, was choſen their Pendragon by the kings; and the crown was fixed hereditary in his family. And, ſoon after the concluſion of them, the royal line of the Creones being extinguiſhed, their dominions muſt neceſſarily have devolved to the monarchs of Ireland. This was aſſuredly the great occaſion that firſt ſettled a colony of the Scots in Caledonia. The occaſion indeed is merely conjectural: but it has ſuch ſtrong coincidencies of reaſon and fact in ſupport of it, as almoſt lend it the ſanction of Hiſtory. The royal line of Ireland appears deciſively from Oſſian, to have been the younger branch of the houſe of the Creones. This houſe appears as deciſively to have finally failed in the perſon of Oſſian, about the year 320. And in the year 320 we ſee a body of Scots detached from Ireland, and ſettling in the country of the Creones. The monarch of Ireland would take poſſeſſion of the devolved kingdom, and would naturally give it as an appenage to one

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 443—446.

of

of his ſons. And in 320 Fergus eſtabliſhed himſelf in the country, with a body of troops and the authority of a ſovereign [1]. Theſe acquiſitions of the Scots in Britain were exactly commenſurate with the territories of the Creones, beginning from, or nearly from, the borders of Roſs, and extending to the bank of the Clyde [2]. And the Scots ſettled in the country with the abſolute conſent of the Caledonians, as appears deciſively from the friendly concurrence of both, within only 20 years afterwards, in expeditions into the Roman Province [3]. Nor did they merely ſettle there by conſent. They muſt have taken poſſeſſion of the Creonian dominions, in conſequence of the laws and preſcriptions of the country; as the Creones now aſſumed a new appellation from them, and were denominated, like them, Ar-gathel, Iar-gael, or Ar-gyle. This name has puzzled all the criticks and hiſtorians. But it is nothing more than the IRISH. The Britons being univerſally called Gathel and Gael, ſuch of them as went over into Ire-land, Iar-in, or Er-in, muſt naturally have received the appellation of Iar-Gael, Er-Gael, Ar-Gael, or the Ir-iſh Britons; and the appellation remains to this day among the Iriſh, in their cuſtomary appellation for their own language, Caelich

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 444, and 447.

[2] P. 412, and the dimenſions of Argathel before.

[3] Marcellinus, l. xx. c. 1.

Eir-inach, or the Ir-iſh Britiſh. And the coloniſts of Fergus would as naturally bring it back with them into Britain, retaining the deſignation as the note of their peculiar derivation from Ireland. Theſe are ſuch remarkable and ſtriking coincidencies, with regard to the actuating reaſon of that hiſtorical fact, the ſettlement of the Scots in Caledonia; as perhaps no conjectural reaſon ever poſſeſſed before, and nearly give it all the confidence of atteſted truth.

Thus did the refugees of ſouthern Britain gradually become the denominators of all the Iriſh. And thus did they afterwards eſtabliſh a colony upon the eaſtern ſhore of Caledonia, and in the year 320 firſt fix the appellation of Scots within the iſland of Britain. Thence the name was carried gradually, with their poſſeſſions, over the whole extent of the preſent Scotland. And Hibernians, Caledonians, Roman Britons, and Saxons, have all concurred to form the preſent reſpectable nation of the Scots in Britain.

This then is the genuine origin of the Scots, undiſguiſed by the romantic impertinencies of the Iriſh fabuliſts on the one hand, and undiſtorted by the bold fictions of Caledonian prejudice on the other. And at the cloſe it is curious to obſerve, that the great point which has been ſo long agitated betwixt the Iriſh and the Scotch criticks, and "has for a century and an "half engaged two nations of contending anti-

"quarians

"quarians in war [1]," is now finally determined in favour and disfavour of both. The Iriſh, and their auxiliaries of England, Lloyd, Stillingfleet, Innes, Carte, and others, who aſſerted the Cantabrian or Scandinavian deſcent of the Scots; and ſuch of the Scotch as, in equal oppoſition to both, ſtrenuouſly maintained a Caledonian origin for their anceſtors; theſe were all equally and partially miſtaken. They who aſſerted the Cantabrian or Scandinavian deſcent of the Scots, and were therefore wrong, affirmed likewiſe their immediate deduction from Ireland into Caledonia, and were therefore right. And they who denied the Cantabrian or Scandinavian origin of the Scots, and were therefore right, denied likewiſe their immediate deduction from Ireland, and were therefore wrong. The Scots now appear to have been originally Britons of the South, who migrated from the weſtern ſhore of Britain into Ireland, and afterwards paſſed from Ireland into Caledonia.—And they who affirmed, and they who denied, the Caledonian extraction of the Iriſh Scots, affirmed and denied what was equally true and equally falſe. As the name of Scot was communicated from the South-Britons in the center of Ireland, to all the tribes upon the coaſt, it comprized the Caledonian nations of the Robogdii, the Venicnii, and the Hardinii. And

[1] Hiſtory of Mancheſter, p. 430.

the Scots of these three tribes, who possessed all the North and North-West of the island, from Fair Head to Balyshannon, were all original Caledonians [1].—They also who affirmed, and they who denied, the Caledonian descent of the British Scots, affirmed what they could not prove, but what was yet a truth, and denied what all history denied, and what was yet no falsehood. The Scots, that came from Ireland under Fergus, were brought from the country of the Caledonian Robogdii, from the district in the North-western parts of Antrim, which was formerly denominated Dalrieta and is now named Route, and were therefore called Dalreudini in the days of Bede, and their country Dalrieta to the 11th century [2]. And the Scots, who have given their own denomination to all Caledonia and all Valentia, were Caledonians that had migrated into Ireland, and that re-migrated into Caledonia afterwards. — Lastly: the Irish and the English, who affirmed the derivation of the British Scots from Ireland, and referred, as they both constantly referred, the arrival of these Scots to the commencement of the 6th century, affirmed an indubitable fact

[1] History of Manchester, p. 434, 442, and 443, 444.

[2] Bede, l. i. c. 1, Usher, p. 320, and Camden, p. 769. And the annals of Tigernach, one of the oldest histories that the Irish have, assert the Scots of Caledonia to have been derived from Dalrieta in Ireland. Usher, p. 321.

in

in the former, but contradicted equally the Roman and the Britiſh accounts in the latter, and gave their Scottiſh antagoniſts an infinite advantage over them and the truth. The Scots migrated into Britain, and ſettled in Caledonia, in the year of Chriſt 320, and were therefore aſſociated with the Picts in expeditions into the Province as early as 340, and have their ravages ſo frequently mentioned by the Roman and Britiſh writers, through a ſeries of 90 or 100 years after it.

This is the true ſtate of the caſe betwixt theſe hiſtorical diſputants. The whole authenticated hiſtory of the origin of the Scots, and of their tranſlation to Caledonia, was never yet given without that dubiouſneſs of teſtimony, which was frequently of equal moment on both ſides of the points diſputed, without thoſe adherencies of falſehood which diſparaged even real and actual truths, and in ſuch a manner as was conſiſtent with every note of time and every incident of hiſtory, till it was given in the Hiſtory of Mancheſter. And, what is remarkable, this new ſyſtem of facts is calculated, almoſt equally with Mr. Macpherſon's, to gratify that national pride of the Highlanders, which ought to be moderated, as every other affection of the mind is, but ſhould always be encouraged, as the ſoul of all the national virtues. The Iriſh, that were the progenitors of the Britiſh Scots, were

themſelves the deſcendants of the Caledonians. And, if the Highlanders ſubmitted to the Scots or were reduced by them, they ſubmitted merely to their countrymen, and the Caledonians were reduced by Caledonians. If therefore Mr. Macpherſon had entered into this walk of hiſtory, he might have equally flattered the prejudices of his countrymen, and have opened a dark and important period of our hiſtory. But, unhappily for himſelf, he took a different direction. Reſolving in his own mind to reſcue the early part of our annals from "the poſſeſſion of fiction and "romance[1]," he has unintentionally ſtrengthened the claims of fiction, and has unwittingly endeavoured to add the authority of right to the poſſeſſions of uſurpation. And he has gone on accumulating one romantic notice upon another, though all hiſtory concurred to reclaim him from his error, and though the atteſtations of hiſtory were confirmed by the living teſtimony of language; the Caledonians, who were reduced by the Scots of Er-in or Ire-land, having adopted the appellation of their conquerors; the nation and the country being now univerſally denominated Scots and Scotland; the nation being expreſsly denominated Hibernia as late as the 11th century, and the people the Iriſchery as late as

[1] P. 5.

the

the 14th [1], and their dialect of the British being invariably entitled the Ir-ish or Er-se to the present moment; and the appellations of Scot for the people, and of Erse for the language, being now, in the concurrent usage of all the rest of the islanders, entirely confined and appropriated to the Gael and the Gaelick of the Highlands.

[1] Innes, p. 659, and Sir George Mackenzie, p. 390, V. I.—Irwin in his Hist. Scot. Nomenclatura, 1682, p. 6, says, "Our Isle-men and Highlanders are very oft named Hiberni "by strangers—, and *at this day* the English and our Low-"landers call and count them Irish."

I HAVE now gone over the whole extent of Mr. Macpherſon's hiſtorical arguments with regard to the Britiſh hiſtory. And I have gone over it with a minuteneſs of attention and a punctuality of reply, that was ſcarcely ever beſtowed upon a work before. This I owed to the great credit which Mr. Macpherſon has obtained by his diſſertation with the publick, to the high eſteem which I entertain for his abilities and genius, and to the great importance and obſcurity of the hiſtory. Not a ſingle argument in the Introduction, I believe, is omitted in the reply to it. And my anſwers, I hope, have not turned upon little and circumſtantial points, but on the main and eſſential parts of the queſtion. They have not fluttered merely in idle oſtentations of victory over words and ſyllables. And they have not endeavoured to catch Mr. Macpherſon inſidiouſly in the mere eddy of argumentation. I have conſtantly charged him home, I think, upon the great and leading particulars of the queſtion. And when I have done this, when I have ſhewn the inſufficiency of any argument as to its principal end and deſign, I have then endeavoured to point out the ſubordinate miſtakes in it. I have endeavoured to break the phalanx that was particularly oppoſed to me at the time: and, when the rout was begun, I have ſtudied to improve the victory by purſuing the runaways, and by picking up as many of them as I could.

Theſe troops indeed were more formidable in their appearance on the field, than they have been found in the hour of battle. The gaiety of their attire, and the bravery of their aſpects, promiſed a much greater reſiſtance than I have met with from them. And I, who entered upon the conteſt with a dubious ſpirit, and a tremulous exertion of courage, ſoon warmed with my own ſucceſs, and became aſſured of the victory.

In this, as in the general event of the conteſt betwixt Mr. Macpherſon and me, I may have been deceived by that kindling ardour of ſpirit, which often anticipates the conqueſt it cannot make, or by that deluſive ſelfiſhneſs of judgment, which frequently flatters the vanity with viſionary triumphs. But, when I cooly look back upon the progreſs and the concluſion of the debate, I ſee no reaſon to think myſelf deceived by either the one or the other.

The plan which Mr. Macpherſon had propoſed to himſelf, was to prove the exiſtence of three diſtinct and principal colonies in Britain, to deduce them in an hiſtorical manner from the continent, and to point out their reſpective operations in the iſland. And, as the firſt and earlieſt of the three was to be the progenitors of the preſent Highlanders and Scots, ſo was it alſo to become the original and principal poſſeſſors of Ireland. This Mr. Macpherſon fancied agreeable

to

to the ſuggeſtions of hiſtory, to anſwer to the great revolutions in Gaul, and to correſpond with the interior diſpoſition of Britain. But, to make the real records of both conformable to the demands of this hypotheſis, he has ſtretched out the hiſtory where it was too ſhort, he has curtailed it where it was too long, and has given us a narration at laſt, with ſcarcely a ſingle member of that which we uſed to contemplate in the authors of Greece and Rome. And this is executed with ſuch a groſs perverſion even of his own quotations, and with ſuch plain and manifeſt corruptions even of his own authorities, ſuch erazings of records, and ſuch interpolations of hiſtories, as pain me greatly for Mr. Macpherſon's ſenſibilities, becauſe they exhibit him in a light, I am ſure, the very oppoſite of his real character. Mr. Macpherſon, I am perſuaded, is a gentleman of high honour and ſpirit, and could not voluntarily have been capable of ſuch actions, even in imagination. But what then muſt be the magic power of that prejudice, which could thus bind up the force of a diſcerning ſpirit, and ſuſpend all his faculties of preciſion and judgment; could thus warp his mind from its natural bias of fairneſs, and throw the illiberal hue of diſhoneſty over one of the moſt ingenuous and candid of men! It is ſurely a melancholy inſtance of the weakneſs of the human intellect, even in its manly

manly exertions of ſtrength. And thoſe only have a right to triumph over Mr. Macpherſon, who are placed in ſome ſphere removed at once from the frailties and the virtues of humanity, who live out of the reach of prejudice and the power of paſſion, who have never felt their minds ſeduced by the enchantments of a new hypotheſis, and have never ſuffered their imaginations to be fired, and their underſtandings to be contracted, by the hot calenture of a patriot ſpirit.

Mr. Macpherſon has aſſerted the exiſtence of three colonies in Britain. But he has proved only one of them to have had any being in it. His Gael, as a diſtinct colony from his Cimbri and his Belgæ, he has nowhere argumentatively deduced into the iſland. And that body of the Britons which is peculiarly the object of the author's attention, and made by him the inhabitants of Caledonia and Ireland, has no real exiſtence in his hiſtory at all. The exiſtence of his Cimbri, alſo, is founded wholly on the ſlight baſis of a verbal criticiſm, the groundwork of the name of Cymri. And, if this would be ſufficient authority for ſuch a capital point in his hiſtory, then might "the pillars of the world be rottenneſs, and "earth's baſe be built on ſtubble [1]." But, what is ſtill more remarkable, the whole even of this

[1] Shakeſpear.

argument

argument is itſelf eſtabliſhed upon a ſuppoſition, and upon a ſuppoſition which is groſsly erroneous, and is not even attempted to be proved, That Cimber ſignified, not a native, but a German, Gaul: as the Indian theology founded the world upon the back of an elephant, and planted the elephant itſelf — upon the back of a tortoiſe. And the only one of the three colonies, that is proved to have been in the iſland, is the Belgic. Two thirds of the author's hiſtorical ſyſtem are left ungrounded by himſelf. And the third carries ſuch a ſtrong mixture of falſhood with it, by dividing the Cimbri, or German Celtæ, from the Belgæ, by confounding the original arrival of the Belgæ with the much later deſcent of Diviticacus, and by making the Belgæ to preſs the Cimbri beyond the Humber, and to urge the Gael into Ireland, that even this is in effect unproved by Mr. Macpherſon; and the certain truth is dreſt up with ſuch an accompaniment of falſhood, that we cannot admit it for real hiſtory.

This is a juſt and fair account of the general ſtate of Mr. Macpherſon's work. And, thus defective as he is in the great outline of his Introduction, he has actually filled it up with figures that are all diſtorted from their true proportion, and with objects that ought never to have met in the ſame piece. The arguments in general are dark,

dark, inaccurate, indirect, and contradictory. No regular and ſteady light is diffuſed through the whole, that, like the dawn of day, gradually increaſes as it continues, and enlarges as it proceeds, till it is carried at laſt to a meridian brightneſs. But, inſtead of this, a mere twilight prevails over the work, that gives us continually an indiſtinctneſs of objects, and juſt "flings half "an image on the ſtraining eye;" that, clear in the commencement, is gradually dimmed in the progreſs, one ſhade ſpreading over another, till the objects, that firſt attracted our attention, ſucceſſively ſink from the ſight and are forgotten, and the author at laſt is nearly loſing himſelf and his reader in the dark.

This is, I believe, as juſt a repreſentation as can be given, even by the hand of candour itſelf, of the conduct of Mr. Macpherſon in the general proſecution of his arguments. He has all the marks of genius and ſenſibility about him, but of a genius not tutored in argumentation, and of a ſenſibility not reduced under the diſcipline of thought. He thinks ſtrongly, but not regularly. His mind ſhoots out in vigorous and ſpirited ſallies of ſentiment: but it is not accuſtomed to keep up its vigour, and to maintain its ſpirit, in a painful deduction of ideas. Bleſt by nature with the power, but not borrowing from the

the ſchools the habit, of thinking, the turn of his argumentation is continually irregular, and the general force of his reaſonings is weak and feeble. He is admirably adapted for the briſk eſſays of a ſkirmiſhing war. But he has unwarily entered into a battle, where heavy armour and practiſed evolutions are ſure to gain the day. Not a ſteadily diſtinguiſhing thinker, not a perſeveringly accurate reaſoner, he is ſoon confounded with the multiplicity of his own ideas, and ſeldom ſees the object diſtinctly at which he levels his argument. Spending himſelf too much in attentions to the colouring of his ſtyle, and throwing himſelf out in a gay irradiation of language, he has no inclination to examine his arguments ſeverely, and he has no power to exert the rigours of corrective criticiſm upon them; as the birds under the tropicks have their ſuperior gaiety of plumage deducted to them, by the deprivation of almoſt all the powers of harmony.

From this want of diſcrimination in his ideas, and from this defect of accuracy in his reaſonings, Mr. Macpherſon has even fallen into repeated and groſs contradictions. And this is the moſt ſtriking feature in the whole aſpect of his work. The inconſiſtencies of his reaſonings are ſo great, and the oppoſitions in his quotations, remarks, and incidents are ſo palpable, that his arguments have been compleatly deſtroyed before, by

being only ſet in array againſt each other. The contrariety of parts to parts is ſo glaring, and this begins ſo early in the work, and is continued ſo regularly through it, that in it, as in man, the ſeeds of death are incorporated with the firſt elements of life, that they "grow with its "growth and ſtrengthen with its ſtrength," and, on the firſt occaſion that has invited them forth, have burſt out, as we have ſeen, to the abſolute deſtruction of the whole.

It is not the unhappineſs of Mr. Macpherſon, that he is miſtaken in ſome unimportant circumſtances, that he has miſrepreſented ſome ſubordinate facts, and that he has failed in ſome inconſiderable reaſonings. It is not his unhappineſs, that he is miſtaken in ſeveral circumſtances of conſequence, that he has miſrepreſented ſeveral incidents of importance, and that he has failed in ſeveral conſiderable arguments. And it is not his unhappineſs, that he has even failed occaſionally, or yet frequently, in main circumſtances, in eſſential incidents, and in arguments of the firſt magnitude. But it is his ſingular and unparalleled infelicity, that he has almoſt regularly failed in all; that ſcarcely a circumſtance, a fact, or a reaſoning, however ſlight and inſignificant, is juſt or appoſite; that nearly every important circumſtance, every conſequential incident, and every eſſential argument, are either frivolous in their nature or uſeleſs in their application; and

that

that each capital and leading topic of the work is generally one great chaos of undigeſted materials, arguments without ſhape or form, reaſonings heterogeneous and repugnant, and darkneſs brooding over the face of the whole.

This is ſuch a delineation of a work of learning and genius, that my benevolence is hurt, while juſtice urges my hand to draw it. The portrait is ſtrongly featured. But it is an exact likeneſs. It is the immediate tranſcript of the feelings of my own mind. And it is fully juſtified by the preceding detail of extracts and examinations. Yet, amid the ſterneſt ſeverity of truth, what ſort of ſpirit muſt that be, which ſhall not grieve for the author, while it is obliged to reprobate his work? Who will not particularly ſigh with me over the fate of a writer, that, poſſeſſed of great brilliancy of parts, and furniſhed with conſiderable ſtores of learning, was chiefly unhappy from the ſelection of his ſubject? Mr. Macpherſon might certainly have played his part with the higheſt reputation and ſucceſs, within the circle of truth and incident. But, in a paroxyſm of patriot fondneſs, reſolving to heighten into a demonſtration what was unable to receive even the colouring of probability, he has fallen in the attempt, as every man in the ſame circumſtances muſt have fallen. If the antient giants had exerted their ſingular vigour of body in conteſts with mere mortals, they muſt have been as fortunate

tunate as they were ſtrong; but in a triumphant bravery of ſpirits exalting their aims, and attempting to accompliſh what no force could effect, they neceſſarily failed in their efforts, and were cruſhed by the mountains that they vainly wielded, and were buried under the iſlands that they vainly hurled, in a wild hoſtility againſt the ſkies.

THE END.

INDEX.

ARMORICA.

THE varying extent of it formerly, 214, 215; it probably reached along the whole northern and north-weſtern coaſt of GAUL, 215.

—How far the BRITONS of our iſland migrated into BRETAGNE in FRANCE, 215, 216; the name of BRETAGNE, not impoſed by our iſlanders, but the antient and original appellation of the country, 216—218; the name of the continental BRITONS derived from the ſame principle as that of the Inſular, 218, 219.

BRITAIN.

It was firſt peopled from GAUL, and about what time, 29—32:

—Why called ALBION, 91—93.

—Why called BRITAIN, 95—103.

—When the BELGÆ firſt ſettled in Britain, and how, and how far they carried their poſſeſſions into the iſland, 63—65, and 69—79.

—BELGÆ and ABORIGINES the only general diviſions of the BRITONS, 68, 69.

—The ABORIGINES denominated CIMBRI, and why, 52—55, and 75, 76.

—Both BELGÆ and ABORIGINES denominated BRIGANTES, and why, 71—74, and 98—102.

—Both BELGÆ and ABORIGINES denominated GAEL and WELSH, and why, 76—78, 29, and 122—124.

—Both BELGÆ and ABORIGINES called CALEDONES, and why, 121—124.

—The language of both the ſame, 83 and 145.

—The manners of both very little different, 83—85.

—Why ſome BRITONS called SILURES, 89; why ſome, CANTII, 86, 87; why ſome, TRINOBANTES, 87, 88; why ſome, DOBUNI, 88; why ſome, ORDOVICES, 88, 89; why ſome MÆATÆ, 136, 137; why ſome, PICTS, 219.

—The Britiſh CURRAGHS very capable of tranſporting armies acroſs the ſea, 178—181.

—The SILURES, maſters of the SILLEY iſles, 89.

—The WELSH, why ſo called, and when, 76—79; why called CYMRI, 52—55, and 75, 76.

—The interiors of CALEDONIA well known to the Romans, 107—112; the inhabitants of it firſt formed into one Empire, when, 119, 220; why they call themſelves CAELDOCH, 120, 121; why they were called CALEDONES, 121—124.

—WIGHT, iſle of, the ICTIS of DIODORUS, 219.

GAUL.

The firſt migration of the GAULS recorded in hiſtory, 29.

—The GAULS firſt planted BRITAIN, and when, 29—32, 76—78, &c.

—The firſt irruption of the GAULS into ITALY, when, 24, 25; into GERMANY, when, 29.

—Whence the names of GAULS and CELTS were derived, 19-20, 120-121; what they originally ſignified, 122—124; and how GAUL comes now to ſignify a Stranger, 71—74.

GERMANY.

The firſt migration of the GAULS into it, 29.

—The name of CIMBRI never appropriated to the GERMAN CELTÆ, 51—55; how far it extended, and what it originally ſignified, ibid; how it came to ſignify Robbers, 71—74.

—How the name of AMBRONES in GERMANY came to mean Ferocious Perſons, 71—74.

IRELAND.

The IRISH ſtill attached to the wild fictions of their antient Hiſtory, 3.

—The Romans well acquainted with IRELAND, 108.

—When, and by whom, IRELAND was firſt planted, and occupied from end to end, 150—153.

—Why IRELAND was called IRIS, IERNA, IUVERNA, and HIBERNIA, 149; theſe names invariably applied only to IRELAND by the antients, 240—243, and 247—249.

—Whence the IRISH were called SCOTS, 284—286.

ITALY.

—Not firſt inhabited from GAUL, 20.

—The firſt ſettlement of GAULS in it, when, 24, 25.

—The UMBRI not derivatives from GAUL, 20—24; and yet of the ſame ſtock with the GAULS, 24, 25.

MACPHERSON

MACPHERSON.

(Dr.)—Author of Critical Diſſertations, one of the two principal writers that have lately endeavoured to invert the order of Hiſtory, by making the SCOTCH the aborigines of CALEDONIA, and the planters of IRELAND, 5, 6; a general character of his work, 6; his knowledge of the CELTIC confined, 86, 141-142, 210, &c.

(Mr.)—Tranſlator of OSSIAN, the other principal writer that has endeavoured to invert all hiſtory, in his Prefaces and Notes to OSSIAN, and in his late INTRODUCTION, 5, 6; a general character of the TRANSLATION and the INTRODUCTION, 6, 7; he plumes himſelf much on his knowledge of the CELTIC, but his acquaintance with it confined, 86, 141-142, and 210.

—*Firſt* general argument in the INTRODUCTION refuted, 11—28; contradictions in it, 15-16, 16-17, 17-18, 27, and 27-28; miſquotation in it, 27; its miſtake in CELTIC, 18—20.

—*Second* general argument refuted, 33—58; contradictions in it, 33-34, 34-35, 38, 43-44, 46, 46-48, and 51; miſquotations in it, 35-36, 38—42, 42—44, 44-45, 46—48, and 56; its miſtake in CELTIC, 51—58.

—*Third* general argument refuted, 58—66; its miſtake in CELTIC, 59—61.

—*Fourth* general argument refuted, 68—105; contradictions in it, 80—82, 80 and 83-84, 90 and 94, 94 again, and 103-104; its miſtakes in CELTIC, 70—74, 85—89, 91—93, and 95—103.

—*Fifth* general argument refuted, 106—153; contradictions in it, 106-107, 106 and 108, 109 and 112, 115-116, 125-126, 129, 134, 136, 139-140, 145, and 148; miſquotation in it, 112-113; its miſtakes in CELTIC, 120-121, 121-124, 130-131, 136-137, and 148-149.

—*Sixth* general argument refuted, 155—293; contradictions in it, 161, 162, 166-167, 178-179, 185, 194-195, 245, 247, 253-254, 254-255, 256-257, 259, 267, 279, 280-281, 281 again; its miſtakes in CELTIC, 209-211, 230—233, 236—238, 263—265, 270-271, and 278—280; miſquotations in it, 230-231, 236-237.

—An exact and minute character of the INTRODUCTION, drawn from the whole, 295—304.

MANCHESTER HISTORY.

It has particularly endeavoured to clear up the original annals of CALEDONIA and IRELAND, and to rescue them both from antient fictions and from modern perversions, 7; its efforts vindicated, and its accounts confirmed, *passim*.

—Two mistakes in it rectified, 136, and 137.

—It contains the first authentic history of IRELAND, as to the original population, &c., that has been hitherto published in any language, 153: and the first clear, certain, and consistent account of the origin of the SCOTS, and of their derivation into CALEDONIA, 291.

MARCELLINUS

(Ammianus) — a passage in his history vindicated from the unjust meaning universally put upon it, 237—239.

SCOTLAND.

The genuine SCOTCH, who, 1.

—These have lately recovered themselves from their attachment to the wild fables of their antient history, 1, 2; but have still a strong tendency to the fabulous, and from the old principle, 3, 4; and have therefore endeavoured, particularly of late, to dress up their antient history according to their own fancies and prejudices, 45.

—The IRISH fictions concerning the origin of the SCOTCH, too extravagant to be worth refuting, 155.

—The SPANISH or the SCANDINAVIAN extraction of the SCOTCH, less absurd, but equally false, and easily refutable, 156.

—The SCOTCH are not settled in North-Britain by Bede, before the commencement of the Christian æra, 212, 213.

—Which of the SCOTCH called ALBANICH, and why, 270-271, and 274; which of them called EIRINICH, IRISHERY, &c, and why, 274, and 292, 293.

—ARGYLE, its original extent, 278, 279; why so called, 287, 288.

—What gave rise to the name of SCOT, 284—286; whence it came into CALEDONIA, and how it covered the whole country, 286—288; the controversy concerning that origin being now finally adjusted, after it has lasted near two centuries, 288—291.

BINDING SECT NOV 4 1969

DA
135
M228

Whitaker, John
The genuine history of the Britons asserted in a full and candid refutation of Mr. Macpherson's Introduction to the history of Great Britain and Ireland

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY